

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OU_158614

UNIVERSAL
LIBRARY

OSMANIA UNIVERSITY LIBRARY

Call No. 943.C87 Accession No. G. 1121
K 945

Author Khrushchev, N.S.

Title Soviet Stand on Germany. 1961

This book should be returned on or before the date last marked below.

THE SOVIET STAND ON **GERMANY**

9 Key Documents Including Diplo-
matic Papers and Major Speeches
by N. S. Khrushchev

Proposals for a German Peace Treaty

WITH
A LETTER TO THE
AMERICAN PEOPLE
FROM NIKITA S.
KHRUSHCHEV

P. G. KENNEDY
CROSSCURRENTS PRESS

DOCUMENTS OF CURRENT HISTORY NO. 17

THE SOVIET STAND ON GERMANY is one of a series of translations being published by CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC. in response to the growing demand for information and source material on Soviet developments. The items in this series are issued for purposes of information, and the publication of an article, study or report, implies neither acceptance nor rejection of the ideas contained therein.

©COPYRIGHT BY CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC.

NEW YORK, 1961

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

A copy of this material has been filed with the Department of Justice where the registration statement of CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, INC., 156 Fifth Avenue, New York 10, N.Y., as a representative of The International Book Co. (Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga) Moscow, is available for inspection. Registration does not indicate approval or disapproval of this material by the United States Government.

Foreword	5
Letter from N. S. Khrushchev to American Readers	7
Memorandum on a Treaty with ⁶ Germany	17
N. S. Khrushchev's Moscow Radio and Television Speech on his Meeting and Talks with John F. Kennedy in Vienna, June 3 and 4, 1961	22
Speech by N. S. Khrushchev at a Moscow Meeting Marking the Twentieth Anniversary of the Beginning of World War II, June 21, 1961	44
N. S. Khrushchev's Speech at a Soviet-Vietnamese Friendship Meeting in Moscow, June 28, 1961	63
N. S. Khrushchev's Speech at a Kremlin Reception for Graduates of Military Academies, July 8, 1961	74
The Soviet Government's Reply to the US Government Note of July 17 on a Peace Treaty with Germany and the Situation in West Berlin, August 3, 1961	93
Radio and Television Speech by N. S. Khrushchev, August 7, 1961	108
Address by N. S. Khrushchev at a Soviet-Rumanian Friendship Meeting at the Grand Kremlin Palace, August 11, 1961	133
The Soviet Government's Reply to the US Government Note of August 17 on Strengthening Controls on the Border Between the German Democratic Republic and West Berlin, August 18, 1961	151

FOREWORD

Twice in this century Germany has ignited devastating world conflagrations. Now the world again views with apprehension the dangerous developments taking place there. But this time the stakes are much higher; the lives of hundreds of millions of people are involved.

Totally different interpretations of the German question have grown up in the United States and the Soviet Union. If these differences existed over less important matters, no one would care too much. But the issues involved have brought the two strongest powers in the world face to face with each other in a hostile stance. No confrontation of states has ever demanded more sober thinking as a means for finding a peaceful resolution of a deadly impasse.

The Editors of CROSSCURRENTS PRESS, believing that full knowledge of the Soviet position would be useful to Americans in seriously assessing the German problem, sent a request to the Chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers, Nikita S. Khrushchev, for a statement of his views. He responded in the form of a "Letter to American Readers," together with permission to publish nine documents as a volume setting forth in great detail the Soviet stand on Germany. Needless to say, we are gratified by the full reply given to us by Chairman Khrushchev. We also wish to acknowledge the translations of these documents supplied by Novesti Press Agency.

It would seem that sane men on both sides agree that the supreme interest of both the Soviet people and the American people is self-preservation, and that this gives us a common interest which transcends all ideological differences. The suffering and wrong which another war would bring about are beyond our imaginations. If war is the supreme irrationality of our time, then we must talk. To talk we must know. We sincerely hope that our effort in publishing this book will be a contribution to both knowing and talking.

A LETTER FROM N. S. KHRUSHCHEV TO AMERICAN READERS

I consider it a sensible and timely show of initiative on the part of CROSSCURRENTS PRESS to provide American readers with an opportunity to get acquainted with the speeches and documents stating the position of the Soviet Government in regard to the German problem, particularly concerning the question of concluding a peace treaty with Germany. Never before has it been so important for the public of all countries to have a clear idea of the real motives and position of those states on whose actions depends the solution of this urgent international problem.

By familiarizing themselves with these speeches, Americans will get first-hand, comprehensive information about the Soviet Union's stand. This is all the more important in view of the fact that our stand on the conclusion of a peace treaty is often presented inaccurately and sometimes is even distorted. That is why in this letter to American readers I would like to familiarize them with the actual state of affairs and present my point of view on a German peace treaty.

To begin with, I beg to be forgiven for possible repetitions of what I have said on this score earlier. But in such an important matter it is particularly vital to avoid misconceptions and biased appraisals. What makes this even more important is that the proposal on the conclusion of a peace treaty with the two German states which are former Germany's legal heirs, put forward by the Soviet Union and various other countries which fought against Nazi Germany, has evoked a thoroughly wrong reaction on the part of the Western Powers.

The Government of the Federal German Republic has come out with special bitterness against this solution of the problem although in fact it is the only solution possible in the present situation. The West German Government is supported in its position by the Governments of the United States of America, Great Britain and France, all of whom reject the proposal on the conclusion of a peace treaty with the Federal German Re-

public and the German Democratic Republic, though such a decision does not infringe in any way on the direct interests of the Western Powers. On the contrary it conforms to the vital interests of the Americans, the British, the French and the Germans and also to the interests of all the peoples of the earth, since signing a peace treaty means bringing an end to war and its consequences and going over to normal, peaceful life.

Everyone can see that the solution of the German problem will ensure normal international relations and provide favorable conditions for the development of economic, cultural and scientific contacts. It will also provide a basis for the development of normal and even friendly relations among all countries which want peace and really understand the need for the co-existence of the two existing systems, the capitalist and the socialist.

I would like to stress this point. We propose that the vestiges of World War II be eliminated by the conclusion of a peace treaty. We would have readily concluded such a treaty with a united Germany had a united Germany existed. But there is no united Germany. I do not want here to go into the reasons for the existence on the territory of the former Germany of two states with directly opposite economic and political systems, even though a lot might be said on the subject. Proceeding in policy from the positions of the Potsdam Agreement, the Soviet Union has been actively working to have postwar Germany develop as a united, democratic and peace-loving state. If this did not come to pass, the fault was not with the Soviet Union or the other socialist countries, but with those who as far back as 1947 began carrying out one after another separatist measures aimed at splitting Germany.

However I once more repeat that I do not wish right now to engage in historical research on this matter. Every sober-thinking political figure must proceed from the true state of affairs; and this state of affairs is today as follows: whether we like it or not, two German states, the capitalist Federal Republic and the socialist German Democratic Republic, exist at present in the center of Europe, developing each in its own way.

It is a matter of common knowledge that the German Demo-

cratic Republic time and again addressed the Federal Republic of Germany with the proposal of sitting down at a conference table and starting negotiations as to the future of the German people. These proposals were invariably rejected by the Government of West Germany. The Government of the German Democratic Republic proposed a concrete way for achieving a gradual rapprochement between the two German states, that of setting up a German confederation. By following this path the Germans could have attained the organization of a single German state. Yet this time again the Government of West Germany, far from showing any desire to meet with the Government of the German Democratic Republic to study these proposals, rejected them from the very outset.

What does all this signify? How shall we understand those who speak of setting up a united Germany but refuse to conduct any negotiations with the Government of the German Democratic Republic on measures facilitating the reunification of the German nation? There is obviously only one explanation possible: these gentlemen would like to swallow up the German Democratic Republic. However such situations are solved not through negotiations and contacts, but only by war. No state on earth will ever agree to being swallowed by its neighbor.

West Germany's ruling circles well understand this. They also know that the signing of a peace treaty with the two German states which have really developed on the territory of former Germany would tie their hands, for a peace treaty would write an end to World War II and fix the borders of these two states. With the signing of a peace treaty the Polish-German, Czechoslovak-German and other borders between the German states and their neighbors would finally be legalized.

Incidentally General De Gaulle, President of France, time and again has gone on record in his public speeches about the necessity of fixing the existing Oder-Neisse border — a fact we note with satisfaction. A number of other leading statesmen of the Western Powers have also favored this in tête-à-tête talks although, true enough, have never stated it publicly.

The question of the German borders was actually defined by the Potsdam Agreement. It is now necessary to legalize this agreement in a peace treaty. This is precisely what the Soviet

Union proposes: to sign a peace treaty and thus deprive West German revenge-seekers of the opportunity of claiming foreign territories. When West Germany refuses to conclude peace, refuses to recognize the borders which have taken shape as a result of the war and is again planning an attack on its neighbors, a further delay in signing a peace treaty is tantamount to encouraging the idea of revenge.

However, to attempt revenge would be sheer madness, for this inevitably would result in a world conflict. It is perfectly clear that an attempt on the part of West Germany to swallow the German Democratic Republic would not go unpunished, for the GDR has her true allies who will never desert her in trouble. West Germany also has its allies with whom it is linked by the aggressive NATO pact. Hence an attack by West Germany on the German Democratic Republic would inevitably turn into world war.

This would be a military clash between two powerful systems which have taken shape in the world, each with its large economic potential and, what is most important, with large stocks of thermonuclear weapons on both sides. Such a war would bring so much evil, so much misery and misfortune, it would demand such heavy sacrifices, that if all the military losses suffered by mankind during its entire history were summed up, they would in no way compare to the losses the unleashing of a third world war would cause.

The designs of those leaders in West Germany who persistently refuse to sign a peace treaty and who desire to retain freedom of action for an attack on the German Democratic Republic are fraught with just such consequences.

I wish that everyone would think this over calmly and objectively, appraise the situation at hand and understand what we are striving for. We are striving for only one thing: for peace, peace and only peace. For the sake of this we stubbornly insist on the urgent signing of a peace treaty—I once more repeat, not a military agreement, not a pact for preparing for war, but a peace treaty—with the two German states which have come into being on the territory of the old Germany.

The argument that it is impossible to sign such a treaty until these two German states unite simply does not hold water. It

is trotted out merely in order to offer some sort of objection, for it is impossible bluntly to object to the signing of a peace treaty in general.

What hits the eye is that the opponents of a peaceful settlement of the German question have at present raised a special hullabaloo around West Berlin. In reading certain American papers one might think that it was all only a matter of West Berlin, although actually this is just part of the general question of a peace treaty with Germany.

The opponents of signing a German peace treaty state that the USA and its allies pledge to defend West Berlin and that is why their troops should remain there forever. Since these troops are stationed there as occupationists and the occupation regime will naturally become void with the signing of a peace treaty, they do not want the treaty. On the other hand they do not want to say so out loud. This is why a smear campaign unprecedented in scope has been launched, its authors reiterating that the USSR allegedly wants to seize West Berlin and it is therefore necessary to reinforce and preserve at any cost the occupationist regime of the Western Powers.

What we cannot understand is, on the strength of what rights do the USA and its allies assume the role of gendarmes, protecting certain regimes to their liking in other countries? On the strength of what rights are they the ones to decide which system is suitable for this or that nation? Why are they entitled to declare war to preserve a regime which suits them in a foreign country? Such practices constitute high-handed arbitrariness in international relations. An arbitrary rule of this kind may have the gravest consequences. Only those who want war can act in this manner.

But the fact is that while proposing to sign a German peace treaty, we do not threaten West Berlin in any way. We have no intention to establish a regime to our liking there. On the contrary, we propose that a peace treaty should provide a free city status for West Berlin, that its population live under whatever political and social system it wants to have. We propose to put in the record that no one is entitled to interfere in the affairs of West Berlin and impose his rules on its population. We have said this many a time and we repeat it now.

What then is the trouble? If the USA is really guarding the rights and interests of West Berliners, it has no grounds for concern, since no one intends to encroach on these rights and interests. Together with the United States, Great Britain, France and other countries we are prepared to pledge solemnly to respect and defend the freedom, independence and rights of the free city of West Berlin.

I want to ask my American readers where then are the grounds for whipping up high feelings and war psychosis? On the contrary, it seems that if people are sober-minded and capable of reasoning logically, of understanding plain truths, there is every possibility for sitting down peacefully at a conference table and discussing all the questions connected with ensuring the freedom, independence and sovereignty of the free city of West Berlin, of stipulating the points in a peace treaty.

There now remains the question of free access to West Berlin. The enemies of the conclusion of a German peace treaty are especially vocal on that issue. It is therefore all the more important to clear up this question entirely.

We have said it before and we repeat: no one is encroaching on the freedom of access to West Berlin. On the contrary, in proposing the conclusion of a German peace treaty we emphasize that the freedom of communications with West Berlin must be guaranteed. Like any sovereign state the government of West Berlin should have the right to diplomatic, economic and cultural connections with any country of any continent.

Where do the divergencies lie then? Here is where: we want to put an end to the vestiges of World War II while the Western Powers—the USA, Britain and France—cling to these vestiges in every way possible and try to ensure the access of their troops to West Berlin on the strength of the right of occupation, growing out of the capitulation status of Hitlerite Germany.

But one does not square with the other! Ask any lawyer and he is sure to tell you that once a peace treaty is signed the state of war is eliminated, and if the state of war is eliminated, how can the occupation regime in West Berlin be preserved? It would be impossible!

Clinging to the vestiges of World War II and striving to preserve the occupation regime for all time, the Western Powers give themselves away. They show that in actuality they do not want a peace treaty signed precisely because they are out to preserve the state of war in the very heart of Germany. It is not for nothing, it seems, that the present-day West Berlin leaders, defending not the interests of their population but the interests of the Western Powers, refer to West Berlin as "the cheapest atom bomb planted in the center of a socialist state."

Why do they want to preserve the occupation regime in West Berlin? Obviously in order to preserve there the smouldering embers of World War II, to watch for a convenient opportunity to try to kindle a third world war. Only those interested in this could invent such a name for West Berlin: an atom bomb planted in the heart of a socialist state . . . But I have already spoken about the consequences for all mankind that unleashing a new world war would bring.

Thus it becomes clear that the differences on the West Berlin communications question, which seems a purely technical one at first glance, are actually of great political significance. The access to West Berlin has been and will be free, but it should not be forgotten that West Berlin communications pass through the territory of another sovereign state, the German Democratic Republic.

All sovereign countries abide by the generally accepted rule: if their communications with other countries pass through the territory of a third state, the consent of this third state to use these communications is always required, no matter whether they pass over land, through the air or over water. This applies to any country, whatever its system. This rule is a law of laws, and if we trample upon it there will be no stability in the world, there will be no peaceful existence of states, perhaps there will be no world at all.

The artificial and, I should say, provocative nature of the bellicose commotion raised by certain circles in the West around the question of free access to West Berlin is all the more obvious inasmuch as the Government of the German Democratic Republic has repeatedly declared its readiness to guarantee the

freedom of communications to the free city of West Berlin along principles generally accepted in international practices. And if certain statesmen would have the Soviet Union and other countries sign a peace treaty but maintain the Western Powers' right of access to West Berlin, a right which follows from the occupation status, they are asking for the impossible. Once a peace treaty has been concluded, the victorious countries' rights, stemming from the surrender of the defeated country, naturally come to an end. The German states with which a peace treaty will be signed will henceforth become entirely sovereign countries, and whether other countries like or dislike the regime in either of them all will have to maintain relations with them in accordance with the generally accepted norms of international law.

Whenever discussion turns to a peace treaty with Germany, and hence to the normalization of the status of West Berlin, the representatives of the Western Powers, sensing the weakness of their case legally, resort to considerations of prestige. They do not want to deal with the German Democratic Republic, and after the conclusion of a peace treaty they would like to travel along its roads wherever and whenever they like, without even notifying the authorities of the country through which they pass of their travels.

But one should be consistent in matters of this kind. Let us recall how things were in the matter of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan. It is a known fact that we fought Japan together with the United States. In 1945 the Soviet Army routed the basic nucleus of Japanese troops, the Kwangtung Army in Manchuria. Following the surrender of Japan the Soviet Union together with the United States and other allies worked out control measures for the post-war development of Japan. Soviet representatives actively participated on a basis of equality in the activities of the allied council in Tokyo. But when it came to making peace our allies signed a separate treaty without reckoning with the Soviet Union. They unilaterally abolished the allied council for Japan and began to turn the Soviet representatives out of Tokyo. And although we had definite rights and commitments resulting from Japan's surrender and stipulated in corresponding agreements, our allies did not consider us.

Why then are the United States and its allies now trying to characterize as unlawful our intention to conclude a separate peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic in the event the Western Powers refuse to sign a peace treaty with both German states? That which is convenient to the United States is declared lawful, and that which does not suit it, unlawful. Where is the logic?

Anyone attentively following the development of the international political situation these days can see that by inflaming the atmosphere around the German question more and more the Western Powers are obviously counting on wresting consent out of us by means of threats, hoping to dictate a settlement suitable to them. But you, readers, understand that conditions can be imposed in this way only upon a state that cannot defend its sovereignty. We of course are not such a state, and there is hardly anyone today who deceives himself on this score.

It is clear as day that the Western Powers are artificially whipping up a controversy around the Berlin question, introducing a spirit of military hysteria into it, in order to further aggravate international tensions and create a pretext for unleashing war against the Soviet Union and the whole socialist camp. Claims to the effect that they are supposedly striving for the preservation of the freedom and independence of West Berlin's population are false through and through, since nobody is threatening this freedom and this independence.

We propose as before: let us sign a peace treaty, let us establish for West Berlin the status of a free city, let us give it all the necessary guarantees. We are ready to agree also that these guarantees be supported by the presence in West Berlin of token troops of the United States, Britain, France and the Soviet Union. These troops should be numerically small, truly symbolic, since no large armed force is required to guarantee the status of a free city. In that case an agreement could be reached with the government of the GDR on freedom of communications for these military units.

This actually is our position on the German question, and this is what we are striving for. I want to stress again and again that we are trying to eradicate the remnants of World War II.

We want to see the atmosphere cleansed in Europe and consequently throughout the world, so that all the peoples breathe fresh air, their countries living as good neighbors, building peaceful relations among themselves, so that people live without fear of war.

It is precisely for this reason that the Soviet Government and the governments of the other socialist countries which fought in the war against Hitlerite Germany have firmly decided not to postpone the signing of a German peace treaty any longer.

We shall be sorry if the Western Powers who fought in the war against Hitlerite Germany will not want to sign a peace treaty with both German states. In that case we ourselves shall be forced to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

The settlement of the German issue will pave the way for more fruitful talks on the solution of the most important problem of our day, the problem of general and complete disarmament. And a solution of the disarmament problem will also mean termination of the nuclear tests which are worrying mankind. For when general and complete disarmament has been effected there will be no further need for test explosions. There will be no more troops, no arms and no fear in the world. All honest people are striving for this. And we on our part, the Soviet people, the peoples of all the socialist countries, will exert every effort towards accomplishing this great goal.

Reading the material contained in this book the American public will be able to see once again that the Soviet Union is steadily working for the solution of international problems by peaceful means and in a tranquil atmosphere.

I avail myself of this occasion to convey all best wishes to the American people and to repeat that the Soviet Government and the Soviet people sincerely wish to have the friendliest relations with the United States of America. Establishment of such relations will benefit not only our two peoples but the peoples of all countries. The cause of peace can only gain from it.

N. KHRUSHCHEV

August 21, 1961.

MEMORANDUM ON A TREATY WITH GERMANY

Presented to President Kennedy by Chairman Khrushchev

1. The peace settlement with Germany, dragged out for many years, has largely predetermined the dangerous development of events in the post-war period. Highly important Allied decisions on rooting out militarism in Germany, which the governments of the United States and the USSR regarded at the time as a guarantee of enduring peace, were implemented only in part and are now virtually not observed on the greater part of German territory. Of the governments of the two German states that took shape after the war only the Government of the German Democratic Republic (GDR) recognizes these agreements and adheres to them. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) openly expresses its negative attitude toward them, fosters saber-rattling militarism, and comes out for a revision of the German frontiers, a revision of the results of World War II. It seeks to build up a strong military base for its aggressive plans, to foster a dangerous hotbed of conflict on German soil and to set at loggerheads the former allies in the anti-Nazi coalition.

The Western powers permitted the Federal Republic of Germany to set about stockpiling weapons and building up an army obviously exceeding defense requirements. Other dangerous steps by the NATO powers were their permission for the Federal Republic of Germany to build warships of up to 6,000 tons displacement, and also to use British, French and Italian territory for military bases of the Federal Republic of Germany.

2. The Soviet Government sincerely strives for the elimination of the causes engendering tension between the USSR and the United States and for a changeover to constructive friendly co-operation. Conclusion of a German peace treaty would bring both countries much closer to this aim.

The USSR and the U.S. fought shoulder to shoulder against Nazi Germany. It is their common duty to conclude a German peace treaty and thus create a firm guarantee that forces which could plunge the world into another, still more destructive war will never rise on German soil. If the Soviet Union's desire to strengthen peace and to prevent the unleashing of another world war in Europe does not differ from the intentions of the United States Government, it will not be difficult to reach agreement.

3. Proceeding from a realistic assessment of the situation, the Soviet Government advocates the immediate conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. The question of a peace treaty is the question of the national security of the USSR and many other states. It is no longer possible to leave the situation in Germany unchanged. All the conditions for the conclusion of a peace treaty have long since matured and such a treaty must be concluded. The essence of the matter is by whom and how it will be concluded and whether there will be unnecessary outlays involved.

4. The Soviet Government does not seek to prejudice the interests of the United States or other powers in Europe. It does not propose any changes in Germany or in West Berlin which would benefit only one state or one group of states. The USSR deems it necessary for the sake of consolidating peace to record the situation that took shape in Europe after the war, to formulate and consolidate *de jure* the immutability of the existing German frontiers, to normalize the situation in West Berlin on the basis of reasonable consideration for the interests of all sides.

For the sake of reaching agreement on a peace treaty, the Soviet Union does not insist on the immediate withdrawal of the Federal Republic of Germany from NATO. Both German states could, for a certain period after the conclusion of a peace treaty, remain members of those military alignments to which they now belong.

The Soviet proposal does not link the conclusion of the peace treaty with the recognition of the German Democratic Republic or the Federal Republic of Germany by all parties to this treaty. To recognize or not to recognize one or another state is a matter for each government to decide.

If the United States is not ready to sign a single peace treaty with both German states, a peace settlement could be effected on the basis of two treaties. In this case the states that are members of

the anti-Nazi coalition would sign a peace treaty with both or with one German state, at their discretion. These treaties do not have to have identical texts but must contain the same provisions on the major questions of a peace settlement.

5. The conclusion of a German peace treaty would also solve the problem of normalizing the situation in West Berlin. West Berlin, deprived of a firm international status, is now a place where Bonn's revenge-seeking elements constantly maintain extreme tension and stage all kinds of provocations very dangerous to the cause of peace. We must prevent such a development under which the strengthening of West German militarism might lead to irreparable consequences due to the unsettled situation in West Berlin.

At present the Soviet Government sees no better solution of the problem of West Berlin than its conversion into a demilitarized free city. Implementation of the proposal for a free city would normalize the situation in West Berlin with due account for the interests of all sides. The occupation regime preserved there has long since outlived itself, has lost any connection with the aims for the sake of which it was created and with the Allied agreements on Germany on the basis of which it has existed.

The occupation rights, of course, would discontinue with the conclusion of a German peace treaty, no matter whether it is signed with both German states or only with the German Democratic Republic, inside whose territory West Berlin lies.

The Soviet Government advocates that the free city of West Berlin freely effect its communications with the outside world and that its domestic order be determined by the free expression of the will of its population. Of course the United States, like all other countries, would have every opportunity to maintain and develop its relations with the free city. In general, as the Soviet Government sees it, West Berlin must be strictly neutral. It must not be tolerated, of course, that West Berlin be used further as a base for provocative hostile activity against the USSR, the German Democratic Republic or any other state or that it continue to remain a dangerous seat of tension and international conflict.

The USSR proposes that the most reliable guarantees be established against intervention in the affairs of the free city by any state. As a guarantor of the free city, token contingents of troops

of the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union could be stationed in West Berlin. Nor would the USSR object to the stationing in West Berlin of troops of neutral countries under United Nations auspices for the same purpose. The status of the free city could be appropriately registered at the United Nations and sealed with the authority of this international organization. The Soviet side agrees to discuss any other measures which could guarantee the freedom and independence of West Berlin as a free, demilitarized city.

The West Berlin settlement must of course in every way take into consideration the necessity of respecting and strictly observing the sovereign rights of the German Democratic Republic, which is known to have expressed its readiness to adhere to a relevant agreement and to respect it.

6. The Soviet Government proposes that a peace conference be called without delay, a German treaty be concluded, and the question of West Berlin as a free city settled on this basis. If for one reason or another the Governments of the United States and other Western powers are at present not yet ready for this, an interim solution could be adopted for a definite period.

The Four Powers will urge the German states to agree in any way acceptable to them on the questions pertaining to a peace settlement with Germany and reunification. The Four Powers will declare in advance that they recognize any agreement which the Germans would reach.

In case of a positive outcome of the talks between the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany a single peace treaty would then be agreed on and signed. If the German states are not able to agree on the aforesaid questions, measures will be taken for the conclusion of a peace treaty with both German states or with one of them, at the discretion of the countries concerned.

In order that the peace settlement not be dragged out, it is necessary to establish a deadline by which time the Germans must explore the possibilities of agreement on questions falling within their internal competence. The Soviet Government regards a period not exceeding six months as adequate for such talks. This period is fully adequate for contact between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Democratic Republic of Germany and for

talks between them, since in the sixteen years since the war understanding of the necessity for liquidating the remnants of World War II in Europe has matured.

7. The Soviet Government is ready to examine any constructive proposals by the United States Government on a German peace treaty and normalization of the situation in West Berlin. The Soviet Government will show the maximum of good will in order to solve the problem of a German peace treaty by mutual agreement between the USSR, the United States and the other states concerned. The signing of a German peace treaty by all parties to the anti-Nazi coalition and a settlement on this basis of the question of the neutral status of West Berlin would create the best conditions for confidence between states and the solution of such major international problems as disarmament, etc. If the United States does not show an understanding of the necessity for concluding a peace treaty, we shall regret this since we would have to sign a peace treaty, which it would be impossible and dangerous to delay further, not with all states but only with those that want to sign it.

The peace treaty will specifically record the status of West Berlin as a free city and the Soviet Union, like the other parties to the treaty, will of course strictly observe it. In addition, measures will be taken to see to it that this status is also respected by the other countries. At the same time this will also mean the liquidation of the occupation regime in West Berlin with all the resulting consequences. Specifically, the questions of using land, water and air communications across the territory of the German Democratic Republic will have to be settled in no other way than through appropriate agreements with the German Democratic Republic. This is only natural, since control over such communications is an inalienable right of any sovereign state.

8. The conclusion of the German treaty will be a major step toward a final postwar settlement in Europe for which the Soviet Union has consistently been striving.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV'S MOSCOW RADIO AND TELEVISION
SPEECH ON HIS MEETING AND TALKS WITH
JOHN F. KENNEDY IN VIENNA, JUNE 3 AND 4, 1961

DEAR COMRADES, FRIENDS:

As you know, I recently returned from Vienna where for two days I met and had comprehensive talks with John F. Kennedy, the President of the United States of America.

Many materials were published in our press, just as in the entire world press, on this score. Many of you have already read the memoranda which were handed to President Kennedy. The first memorandum dealt with the question of ending nuclear weapons tests; and the other, with the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and a solution of the West Berlin problem on this basis. Obviously many of you also read President Kennedy's radio and television speech, which was published in full in our newspapers. Thus Soviet public opinion is well informed about the views which the United States President set forth and his appraisal of our meeting.

Today I should like to express some thoughts, some considerations of mine, about the meeting and talks with President Kennedy in Vienna.

As you already know, this meeting was preceded by an exchange of opinions through diplomatic channels, also by an exchange of messages between the President of the United States and myself. We agreed on the kind of meeting which took place in Vienna on June 3 and 4. This meeting was a good opportunity for the first personal contact and exchange of views on basic problems between the new President of the United States and myself, as Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union.

On the way to Vienna we spent a few days with our Czechoslovak friends and, of course, had very thorough talks with the President of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic and First Secre-

tary of the Communist Party of Czechoslovakia, Comrade Antonin Novotny, and other Czechoslovak leaders.

I happen to have visited fraternal Czechoslovakia several times, and I have always felt there an exceptionally warm and hearty response. I also felt it this time. We were met everywhere like dear friends, like brothers, linked by a community of vital interests and aims.

I avail myself of the opportunity to thank once again the Government of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic, and all our dear friends, Czechs and Slovaks, who gave us such a cordial and hospitable welcome during our stay in their wonderful country, which is confidently advancing along the road of communist construction.

This is the way things are in the relations between our socialist countries—the great common cause of building a new, socialist world has created a blood bond between us, has united us into one close-knit family. Upholding and defending the interests of their peoples, the leaders of our countries at the same time uphold and defend the interests of all peoples of the socialist countries, the great cause of socialism, of an enduring peace on earth.

Going to Vienna for our meeting with the President of the United States, we of course considered in the first place how this meeting would affect not only the relations between our two countries but also the relations between the countries of the new, socialist world and the capitalist countries.

We consider that such meetings are indispensable because under present conditions questions which defy solution through conventional diplomatic channels insistently require meetings between heads of government.

Such meetings are indispensable, on the condition, of course, that these heads of government strive toward the safeguarding of peace between states. On our part we are doing everything in our power to ease international tension and solve cardinal problems in the relations between states.

Before taking up specific questions which were discussed in my talks with the President of the United States, I should like to thank cordially the President of Austria, Mr. Schaerf, Chancellor Gorbach, and Vice-Chancellor Pittermann for all they did to see that the Vienna meeting took place under the most favorable circumstances for both sides. We are grateful to the citizens of beautiful

Vienna for their kind, cordial attitude toward us, representatives of the Soviet Union.

And now, dear comrades, allow me to state our viewpoint on questions discussed between President Kennedy and myself. I should like to state some considerations as to what, in our opinion, is the best way of solving those disputed or outstanding problems in relations between states which have become ripe, or even over-ripe, and which insistently call for a solution.

One of these fundamental, cardinal questions is that of general and complete disarmament.

It is well known that the Soviet Union has been persistently and steadily working for a solution of the disarmament problem. For decades the Soviet state has been raising it before all the world.

It will be recalled that as far back as 1922, at the Genoa conference, the Soviet Union, on the initiative of the great Lenin, proposed general and complete disarmament. In 1927 we raised this question before the League of Nations. At that time we were not able to ensure the solution of this problem and the imperialists subsequently touched off a world war.

Since World War II, which brought so much suffering and disaster to the peoples, we have redoubled our efforts for the earliest possible solution of the disarmament problem. Both within and outside the United Nations we miss no opportunity to press for a positive solution of the disarmament problem and to remove the danger of a new world war.

The Soviet Union took part in the work of the United Nations Atomic Energy Commission which was charged with the task of working out an agreement to ban nuclear weapons.

We also conducted negotiations within the commission on conventional armaments. Starting in 1950, when the Joint Disarmament Commission was set up, the Soviet Union took an active part in its work. For four years our representatives sat on the subcommittee of this commission in London and New York. Many were the proposals submitted, many were the speeches heard, without a single forward step being made toward the solution of the disarmament problem.

A Ten-Nation Disarmament Committee met in Geneva last year, this time with a composition different from those of the bodies that preceded it. Represented on it were five socialist and five Western

states. However, this committee likewise failed to achieve any positive results in view of the unwillingness of the Western powers to accept disarmament.

It is said that had the mounds of paper written up at these commissions and subcommittees on disarmament been dumped into Lake Geneva it would have overflowed its banks. A lot of paper has been wasted without even coming near a realistic solution of the disarmament problem.

The question is: why is it that all these commissions and subcommittees have failed to achieve any success? For the simple reason that the Western powers were plainly not prepared for serious negotiations, did not want—and to be frank—do not want disarmament to this day. It is clear that no government can afford to appear openly before the peoples with such a position! The Western powers are afraid to tell public opinion directly and squarely that they do not want to negotiate disarmament with the Soviet Union in a businesslike way.

The capitalist monopolies are making huge profits out of the arms race and have a stake in its continuation. But to conceal all this, it seems they need to make at least a pretense at negotiation. And so they have chosen the diplomatic approach: without refusing to negotiate outright, they at the same time do not accept concrete proposals on disarmament.

They keep dragging their feet, as the saying goes. A whole system has been worked out to prevent the objective from being reached, to definitely lead disarmament to a dead end.

The proposals on general and complete disarmament which I submitted, on the instructions of the Soviet Government, to the United Nations General Assembly for consideration represent a good basis for the solution of the disarmament problem. These proposals of ours, if accepted, would forever relieve the peoples of the grave burden of the armaments race, of the threat of a nuclear-missile war of extermination.

We said then, and I emphatically repeat now, that if the Western powers agree to general and complete disarmament, the Soviet Union is ready to accept any system of control they may conceive.

But despite this the Western powers claim that it is the position of the Soviet Union that obstructs agreement on disarmament, and that they cannot come to terms with us on these questions.

I repeat once more: the Soviet Union stands for strict and effective international control. We are prepared to accept your proposals on control, Mr. President of the United States, provided you accept our proposals on general and complete disarmament. And then there will be no deadlock in the disarmament talks.

We want honest disarmament; we want to ensure equal terms for all nations during disarmament, so that no one can ever take advantage of disarmament to gain advantages for himself, to the detriment of the security of other nations. Our proposals envisage strict control at each phase of the realization of the disarmament agreement. We consider that if complete disarmament is carried out the most thorough control will be needed. Control agencies should have access everywhere without the so-called veto, without any restrictions. Access should be open at any time and to any place, and we are prepared to provide the control agencies with this.

Only on the condition of general and complete disarmament with the strictest control is it possible to achieve trust and create real conditions for the peaceful coexistence of states wherein no country or group of countries could arm secretly to attack other countries.

Such is our viewpoint. What clearer statement need be made to prevent the Western representatives from reiterating that the Soviet Union does not accept control!

All fabrications to the effect that the Soviet Union does not want control show only one thing—how freely the peoples are deceived in the so-called “free world.” Our world, the world of socialist countries, is excellently informed and knows that we stand for effective control. But in the “free world,” with its “freedom of information,” they are free to dupe society, to repeat patently false contentions in order to mislead the people.

Talks between the USSR and the United States on disarmament problems will begin in Washington on June 19. I should like to hope that this time, at least, we shall meet with a constructive approach on the part of the United States.

Now I should like to dwell on another question on which we exchanged opinions with President Kennedy, the question of the nuclear weapons test-ban talks.

For almost three years we have been negotiating with the United States and Britain on this question. At the very outset of the discussions we submitted a draft treaty to the Western powers for

their consideration. Though this draft meets the interests of all participants in the talks and though during the negotiations we met halfway a number of wishes expressed by the Western powers, the talks failed to produce any concrete results.

Now new difficulties have arisen. The Western powers resolutely refuse to accept our proposal on the forms of control.

What is the substance of our proposal? Allow me to state it briefly. At first we thought it possible to accept the proposal of the Western powers that the executive body of the system controlling the observance of the test ban be headed by one man appointed by agreement between the sides. But the events in the Congo made us wary, taught us, one might say, a lesson. The Government of the Republic of the Congo appealed to the United Nations for assistance in the struggle against the Belgian colonialists who sought to restore their colonial domination over that country. The Security Council and the General Assembly adopted a number of good resolutions in this connection. But what happened after that?

Mr. Hammarskjöld, who poses as a neutral person, taking advantage of his position as Secretary General of the United Nations, interpreted and realized these decisions of the Security Council and the General Assembly in such a way as to please the colonizers. Is this not attested to by the foul assassination of the Prime Minister of the Congo Republic, Patrice Lumumba—the head of the very same government which requested assistance from the armed forces of the United Nations against the outrages of the colonizers?

The tragedy of the Congolese people has clearly borne out the consequences which may result from arbitrary actions of the executive body of the United Nations in the person of a single Secretary General. We must do our utmost to prevent a repetition of such action. This is what the interests of the peoples, the interests of the preservation of peace demand.

Precisely because of that, the Soviet Government has arrived at the firm conviction that control over the observance of a nuclear weapons test-ban treaty must be exercised with the participation of representatives of the three existing groups of states—the socialist countries, the member countries of Western military alliances, and nations following a neutral policy; and that the representatives of these three groups of states may adopt only decisions agreed upon by all.

The Soviet Union has never demanded, nor does it demand any exceptional status for itself. We do not seek to dominate the Control Commission, but neither shall we allow anyone to dominate us. We demand for ourselves precisely the same rights as the other parties to the treaty. What we want is to ensure that there be no abuses on the part of the control organization.

And what do the Western powers want? They want to impose upon us a "neutral" person of some kind as the sole interpreter and executor of the treaty.

In other words, they want to foist upon us in this post some new Hammarskjöld so that he may supervise control over all the territory of our country. Frankly speaking, they want such a man to allow them to conduct espionage within our territory in the interests of the West. To this of course we cannot agree and will never agree, because this concerns the security of our country.

It is clear to everyone, of course, that the ending of nuclear weapons tests would not be enough to prevent a nuclear-missile war.

We can ban nuclear weapons tests, but the existing stocks will remain, the production of these arms may continue and, consequently, their stockpiling will go on. Thus the danger of a nuclear-missile war will keep mounting. It is quite obvious that the ending of nuclear weapons tests alone cannot be considered a dam barring the way in the arms race.

Judging by everything that has taken place, it is difficult to reach agreement on the ending of nuclear weapons tests at the Geneva talks because of the position taken by the Western powers.

The main thing at present is to solve without delay the question of general and complete disarmament. We told the United States President: let us solve both problems jointly—the problem of tests and the problem of general and complete disarmament. Then it will be easier to reach agreement on the setting up of an executive control body. Under conditions of general and complete disarmament the question of international security will appear in a new light. There will be no armies and no danger of one state attacking another. Under these conditions the Soviet Government will be ready to accept the Western powers' control proposals.

We shall agree that provisions should be made for a control system without any restrictions by any side, including the country

in whose territory the inspection is carried out. This will remove any danger of control being used for spying against a state. And this is perfectly logical, because if there are no armies, no arms race, nations will have no military secrets, and then the Western representatives will be able to enter any door, any plant or institute in our country, just as will our representatives in their countries.

Evaluating the possibilities of an agreement to end nuclear weapons tests under conditions in which there is no agreement on general and complete disarmament, we must also not ignore this important circumstance: at a time when negotiations for ending nuclear tests are under way among the Three Powers—the Soviet Union, the United States of America, and Britain—France is staging tests in defiance of the protests of world public opinion and governments, ignoring repeated decisions passed by the United Nations, decisions urging states to refrain from such tests. Thus a peculiar situation obtains: while we seek agreement with the Western powers in Geneva, an ally of these powers—France—continues testing nuclear arms and declares that the Geneva talks do not put her under any obligation. Consequently France, a member of NATO, the aggressive military bloc which does not conceal that it is directed against the Soviet Union, is able to perfect nuclear weapons in the interests of her Western allies.

Moreover we must reckon with the fact that France's example may be followed by other countries when they have the appropriate scientific and technical prerequisites.

Of course, we can understand the peculiar logic of the Western powers, which apparently do not have confidence in their allies in the military blocs and wish to ensure their independence by relying on their own nuclear weapons. The President of France, General de Gaulle, says, for instance, that he wants to have his own nuclear arms so as to enable France to conduct an independent policy. But other countries ensnared in the Western bloc may state that they do not want to place reliance on the nuclear test-ban treaty under conditions wherein the states possessing nuclear weapons will retain them after the signing of such an agreement. Obviously they can also repeat the arguments now used by France in order to justify the holding of tests, can strive to develop their own nuclear weapons and join the so-called "nuclear club."

This, of course, is logic injurious to the cause of peace. It can be used and is already being used by those circles in the West which do not want to renounce nuclear arms, continuing to depend on these weapons of mass annihilation.

All this brings us to the conclusion that we must link the solution of the question of ending nuclear weapons tests with the problem of general and complete disarmament. Under existing conditions it seems no other way out can be found.

In the course of the exchange of views with the President, we set forth in detail our viewpoint concerning the interdependent solution of the problem of general and complete disarmament and the ending of nuclear weapons tests. We should like the United States Government to understand our view correctly. This would help to find a basis for agreement.

The peoples expect the governments to expedite the solution of the question of general and complete disarmament in order to safeguard peace. This is why all world public opinion is raising its voice to demand that the governments which do not show an interest in the solution of this problem stop sabotaging and dragging out the talks. It is high time to take the disarmament problem out of the labyrinth of empty talk, where it has remained for many years.

Permit me now to turn to the German question, which occupied an important place in our talks with President Kennedy.

The Soviet Government has repeatedly stated its position on this question. And the Western powers cannot complain that they do not know our proposals sufficiently well. We have done and are doing everything to convince the Governments of Britain, the United States of America, France, and the other nations which took part with us in the war against Hitler Germany that the absence of a peace treaty with Germany has created a deeply abnormal and dangerous situation in Europe.

It has always been recognized that peace treaties should be concluded after wars between states have ended. This has already become a custom and, if you wish, a standard of international law. Instances of this can also be found in international practice after the end of World War II. Peace treaties with Italy and the other states that fought on the side of Hitler Germany were signed more than fourteen years ago. The United States of America, Britain

and the other countries concluded a peace treaty with Japan in 1951. But the governments of these selfsame countries will not countenance the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

Can such a situation continue into the future? After all, the peoples of Europe are vitally interested in the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany. It has long been awaited by the peoples of Poland, Czechoslovakia and all the other states bordering on Germany. This treaty is essential to both German states, the German Democratic Republic (GDR) and the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG). The populations of these countries live by the hope that a line will be drawn, at long last, through World War II and the German people will maintain relations with neighboring nations on the basis of mutual confidence.

The question seems to be clear. A peace treaty with Germany is indispensable. Moreover, of course, there can be no question of any new changes of borders. We proceed from the premise that the peace treaty with Germany will put a seal on what has already been established by the Potsdam Agreement. The Government of the GDR has repeatedly stated that it recognizes as final the eastern border of Germany along the Oder-Neisse line, established by this agreement, and regards it as a boundary of peace between the German and the Polish peoples.

Indeed the governments of the Western powers obviously understand, too, how senseless it would be to raise the question now of revising Germany's boundaries. Their representatives have often told us about this during our conversations.

French President General de Gaulle, for instance, publicly stated that the German people "must not question the present frontiers in the West, East, North and South." Even Chancellor Adenauer, the "cold war" herald and specialist in stirring up passions among states, came out with a statement to the effect that the FRG does not strive to alter the frontiers through war, through the use of force.

Then why not sign the peace treaty, if everyone realizes clearly that the present frontiers of Germany cannot be altered without war, and war, as the Western governments declare, is not wanted by them?

A simple operation, it seems—to put a seal on what actually already exists and what has long been demanded by the peoples.

What is it then that keeps the Western governments from this step?

The reason, obviously, lies in the fact that certain people do lip service to peace while actually wishing to keep alive the smoldering coals of World War II, in order to choose a suitable moment to fan the conflagration of a new war. For this purpose more and more new divisions are being formed in West Germany and Chancellor Adenauer is demanding atomic weapons for his army. What is the purpose of all this? After all, neither a big army nor atomic weapons are needed to retain what West Germany possesses today. However, there are forces there which still covet what does not belong to them and cannot resign themselves to the existing borders. What would an attempt to change the frontiers at present mean? It would mean war, and a thermonuclear war at that.

That is why the position of the enemies of a peaceful settlement with Germany cannot but put the peoples on their guard. They have the right to say: if you are for peace, prove it by deeds—sign a peace treaty and pursue your policy in conformity with it.

In the conversations with me, President Kennedy, and as a matter of fact other Western representatives too, referred to the fact that the Western powers bear some sort of obligation to the residents of West Berlin and that these obligations cannot be affected even by the conclusion of a German peace treaty. It is natural to ask, however, what obligations they feel must be maintained if all of them follow from the surrender of Hitler Germany and from the provisional Allied agreements and, consequently, can be valid only until the peace treaty is signed. What is more, there are in general no special Allied commitments with regard to West Berlin. The Allied obligations applied to the entire territory of Germany and it was precisely these agreements that were grossly violated by the Western powers. They turned West Germany into a militarist state, founded a military bloc directed against us, and in this bloc Federal Germany plays a primary part. The generals who commanded Hitler's troops, who committed atrocities in the Soviet Union, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Albania, Yugoslavia, France, Greece, Belgium, Norway and other countries now hold a commanding position in NATO.

It has always been the case that after the signing of a peace treaty, the conditions of capitulation lose force on the entire territory which the treaty covers and throughout this territory the

occupation terms are lifted. Consequently, West Berlin, which is situated on the territory of the German Democratic Republic, will, after the signing of the peace treaty, be free of all the conditions established as a result of the capitulation of Hitler's Germany and the introduction of the occupation regime there.

It should be said that when the question of a peace treaty with Germany, and consequently of the normalization of the situation in West Berlin, arises, the representatives of the Western powers in many cases depart from legal grounds and start appealing to questions of prestige. But these attempts are beneath criticism. I should like to mention a fairly recent case.

We fought together with the United States against Japan; our peoples shed blood together. The Soviet Army routed the main nucleus of the Japanese Army—the Kwantung army in Manchuria.

The Soviet Union, together with the other countries that fought against Japan, took part in drafting the measures for controlling Japan's postwar development. A Far Eastern Commission was set up in Washington and an Allied Council for Japan, with headquarters in Tokyo. In these bodies Soviet representatives took a most active part, on an equal footing.

Then it came to the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan. Our allies disregarded the views of the Soviet Union and signed a separate peace treaty with Japan. I shall not dwell on the reasons which at that time determined the position of the Soviet Union on the question of a peace treaty with Japan, since now we are speaking of a different matter—of the way the United States treated its ally in that case.

It unilaterally abolished the Allied Council for Japan and deprived the Soviet representatives of all rights. Our representatives were virtually in mid-air—they were being pushed out of Tokyo by every means, yet we had certain rights and obligations which stemmed from the capitulation of Japan and which were stipulated in the corresponding agreements.

So you see that then the Americans disregarded both the rights of the Soviet Union and the international agreements. Leaning on its superiority in atomic weapons, the United States sought to dictate conditions not only to conquered Japan but also to its allies in the war against Japan.

More than two years ago we published our draft of a peace

treaty with Germany. It contains nothing detrimental to the interests of our former allies or, incidentally, to the Germans themselves.

The Soviet Union, which suffered greater losses than all the rest of the allies in the anti-Hitler coalition put together, proposes the conclusion of a peace treaty in order to normalize the situation in Europe, to normalize the relations with both German states. Meanwhile the United States, Britain and France, together with Federal Germany, do not want to sign a peace treaty; they seek to preserve an indefinite and dangerous situation. They refuse to abolish the remnants of the last war through the conclusion of a peace treaty and insist on keeping the occupation regime and their troops in West Berlin.

Every person, if not deprived of common sense, understands that the signing of a peace treaty is the road toward improving relations between states. The refusal to sign a peace treaty and the perpetuation of the occupational regime in West Berlin are directed at continuing the cold war, and who can say where lies the borderline between a cold war and a war in the full sense of the word? Surely it is clear that a cold war is a period of preparation, of accumulating forces for war.

I speak of all this so that everyone may understand the gravity of the danger incurred by any further delay in the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

When we suggest signing a peace treaty with Germany and turning West Berlin into a free city, we are accused of wanting, allegedly, to deprive the Western powers of access to this city. But that is a wrong and an unworthy argument. The granting to West Berlin of the status of a free city would mean that all countries of the world wishing to maintain economic and cultural ties with this city would have the right and opportunity freely to maintain these ties. Of course, agreement would have to be reached with the country across whose territory pass the communications that link West Berlin with the outside world. That is normal. Otherwise the sovereignty of the state in which West Berlin is situated would be jeopardized.

The governments of the Western powers claim that they have pledged to defend the freedom and well-being of the population of West Berlin. In the Four Power agreements on Berlin, however,

nothing is said of these obligations on the part of the United States, Britain and France. The idea of ensuring freedom for the population of West Berlin can in itself arouse no objections from anybody. None other than the Soviet Union suggests that the political and social regime in West Berlin be the one which its population wants.

That means that no hand is lifted against the freedom of West Berlin, nor are there any obstacles to access to the city. We repeated in the past and repeat again: a peace treaty will create all the necessary conditions for ensuring the liberty of the free city of West Berlin and its unhampered ties with the outside world. Naturally, in solving the question of access to West Berlin it is essential to abide by the generally accepted international norms, that is to use the territory of the country through which the roads of access pass only under agreement with its government.

Such a situation is recognized as normal by everyone, so why should it be considered abnormal to ask the consent of the German Democratic Republic to pass through its territory to West Berlin? After all, the ground routes to West Berlin pass through its territory, the waterways also run through its territory, as well as the air routes.

Consequently, after the conclusion of a peace treaty, countries wishing to maintain ties with West Berlin will have to reach agreement with the German Democratic Republic on ways of access to West Berlin and communications with this city.

We are not suggesting anything unusual. That is the way it has been in relations between equal states for hundreds of years, perhaps even many hundreds of years. We did not invent this: it exists not only *de facto*, but also *de jure* and long ago became the general rule.

When the Soviet Government suggests concluding a peace treaty and normalizing on this basis the situation in West Berlin, it wants only peace, it wants to remove from relations between states everything that causes friction and could cause a dangerous conflict. It is not the socialist countries but the Western powers that are throwing out a challenge to the world, when despite common sense they declare that they will not recognize the conclusion of a peace treaty and will seek to preserve the occupation regime in West Berlin, which they—if you please—conquered. That is not a

policy of peace; that is trampling on the most elementary norms in relation between states. It is a desire to preserve a state of extreme tension in international relations and, moreover, it is a threat of war.

The Soviet Union and our friends do not want war, and we will not start it. But we will defend our sovereignty, will fulfill our sacred duty to defend our freedom and independence. If any country violates peace and crosses the borders—land, air or water—of another, it will assume full responsibility for the consequences of the aggression and will receive a proper rebuff.

The world press has published many comments on our meetings and talks with President Kennedy. Among these comments there are many sensible statements made in the United States, in Britain, in France and in West Germany, not to mention the German Democratic Republic and the other socialist countries. But there are hate-ridden persons, deprived of common sense, who oppose negotiations with the Soviet Union and call for a crusade against communism. They are organizing new provocations all the time. And it was by no means accidental that numerous gatherings of revenge-seekers at which belligerent speeches were made by Adenauer and other leaders of the Bonn government in Federal Germany were timed to coincide with the Vienna meeting.

The opponents of a normalization of the international situation have launched a new, big provocation in West Berlin, where since the beginning of June committees of the West German Parliament have been meeting, and where a session of the Bundesrat is scheduled for June 16, although West Berlin never was and is not at present a part of Federal Germany. Evidently in West Germany itself a shortage of *lebensraum* for provocations is being felt.

The lengths of folly to which persons blinded by their hatred for socialism can go is revealed by the statement of the Canadian-American Interparliamentary group published a few days ago. These parliamentarians howl like hyenas and threaten nuclear war. They have not seen war on their territory. I do not know whether they personally took part in a war or not; but it is absolutely clear that they have no idea what a modern thermonuclear war is like, if they are pushing their countries, and with them others, into a conflict. Now any war, even if it begins as a conventional war, nonnuclear, can develop into a devastating nuclear-

rocket war. The peoples should put straitjackets on the madmen who are pushing toward war.

The peoples of Europe know what war is. We have had to take part in two world wars. Twenty years ago a war was forced on the Soviet people, the most bloody and difficult war in our history. The enemy reached the threshold of Moscow, he reached the Volga, occupied and devastated a considerable part of Soviet territory. But the Soviet Union withstood the drive of the enemy and won that war. We went to Berlin and punished those who unleashed the war.

We do not want another world war—we want peace. The Soviet people have achieved good mutual understanding with the Germans of the German Democratic Republic. The best of relations have developed between the Soviet Union and the German Democratic Republic; the conviction has grown that we should be friends, not enemies, and that this friendship is useful and advantageous to both peoples. The Soviet people also wish to have good relations with the Germans of West Germany. Our people want to be friends with the French. We fought together with them against Hitler Germany, and each of us has learned from his own experience what fascism means, what war means. We want friendship with the British, the Americans, Norwegians and other peoples of the anti-Hitler coalition with whom we fought for peace on earth. We have no reason to quarrel with any people; we want to live in friendship and concord with all peoples.

To that end the Soviet Union is proposing to sign a peace treaty with Germany jointly with other countries. And this peaceful step is called a threat or even an act of aggression! Such talk can come only from those who seek to slander or distort our intentions, to poison the minds of the peoples with lies.

We ask everyone to understand us correctly: the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany cannot be postponed any longer; a peaceful settlement in Europe must be attained this year. We call on all countries that fought against Germany to take part in the peace conference when agreement is reached on its convention. The question now is not whether or not to sign a peace treaty, but whether the peace treaty will be signed with the two existing German states—the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany, or with one of the German states—whether

all countries that fought against Germany will participate in the peace settlement, or only some of them.

The governments of some countries have announced in advance that they will not take part in a peace conference. The Soviet Union will, of course, regret it if some countries evade the signing of a German peace treaty; we have always wanted and still want all countries of the anti-Hitler coalition to take part in the peaceful settlement of the German question.

But even should certain countries refuse to take part in the negotiations on the conclusion of a peace treaty, that will not stop us; together with other countries which do desire it, we shall sign a peace treaty with the two German states. Should Federal Germany not agree to sign a peace treaty, we shall sign it with the German Democratic Republic alone, which has long declared her desire to conclude a peace treaty and has agreed to the formation on her territory of a free city of West Berlin.

There are some in the West who threaten us, saying that if we sign a peace treaty it will not be recognized, and that even arms will be brought into play to prevent its implementation.

Evidently they forget that times are different now. If even in the past the "position of strength" policy was useless against the Soviet Union, then now it is more than ever doomed to failure. The Soviet Union is against the use of force in relations between states. We stand for a peaceful settlement of controversial questions between states. However, we are capable of giving a proper rebuff to any use of force, and we have what is needed to defend our interests.

During the meetings in Vienna there was also an exchange of views on the situation in Laos and on a peaceful settlement of the Laotian question.

The communique says on this matter that the President of the United States and the Prime Minister of the USSR "reaffirmed their support of a neutral and independent Laos under a government chosen by the Laotians themselves, and of international agreements for ensuring that neutrality and independence; and in this connection they admitted the importance of an effective cease-fire in Laos."

The Laotians are a peace-loving people. Having taken the road of independent development, their country threatened no one and

was not a source of tension. That situation lasted until the imperialists decided to turn Laos into their military springboard, into a base for preparing aggression.

An uprising was organized against the legitimate government of Prince Souvanna Phouma. The rebels received arms and military advisers from the United States. Peace in the country was disrupted, a war started—a war which because of outside interference threatened to develop into a big conflagration. An extremely dangerous situation for peace developed in Southeast Asia.

The American side does not now hide the fact that the responsibility for the dangerous events in Laos lies with the previous United States administration and that its policy in that part of the world was not always wise. In March of this year Mr. Kennedy stated that the government he heads would seek to create a neutral and independent Laos. So far as the Soviet Union is concerned, we stood in the past and stand today for Laos as an independent and neutral state, not a tool in the hands of military blocs; we believe that no one should interfere in the domestic affairs of that country.

Thus before the meeting in Vienna there existed sufficient grounds to find a basis for agreement on a peaceful settlement in Laos.

During the discussions of the Laotian question with President Kennedy it appeared that our approach was similar. I declared that to settle this question it was essential to ensure the formation of an independent and neutral Laos. At the same time it was necessary to separate distinctly external problems from domestic ones. The domestic policy of Laos cannot and should not be determined by the USSR, or the United States, or other countries. If any countries were to establish how Laos should live and what government it should have, then it would not be an independent, neutral Laos but a Laos governed from the outside. And that is impermissible. The three political forces acting in Laos must themselves form a government which will uphold the principles of independence and neutrality. The Soviet Union will welcome such a policy and will do everything in its power for it.

I told President Kennedy all this, and it seemed to me that the President received what I told him with understanding. He declared that our two countries should influence the corresponding

political groupings in Laos in order to achieve agreement among them on the formation of a single government and its program on the basis of recognition of independence and neutrality. We consider such an approach sensible.

We are firmly convinced that no one should interfere in the domestic affairs of Laos, because the interference of any one side could be fraught with very dangerous consequences. It is essential to approach the settlement of the Laotian problem carefully and cautiously, and not allow anything to complicate the possibility of a peaceful settlement in Laos.

In this connection we drew attention to the fact that the use of American officers as military advisers to the rebel troops meant interference in domestic affairs on the side of a definite political grouping. Such an approach runs counter to recognition of the policy of neutrality for Laos and is open interference in its domestic affairs. If the present policy of connivance with the rebels continues, then the course of events could lead to bad consequences.

It is all the more impermissible that certain persons in the United States have not given up their plans for sending Marines into Laos and waging war there with the help of special military units. In the United States these units are, for some reason or other, called guerilla units.

In reality they are nothing but subversive and sabotage troops designed to act against the peoples of those countries whose regimes do not suit the ruling circles of the United States. It can be said in advance that those who seek to try such methods have not weighed all the consequences for themselves.

If the United States Government really seeks peace in Laos, it should promote the speedy success of the talks in Geneva. No one should delay these talks under various invented pretexts, claims that there has been a violation of the cease-fire agreement in Laos. If there have been such cases, then it was not the national patriotic forces that were responsible. The American side and its military advisers in Laos are well aware of this.

We shall continue our efforts to ensure a peaceful settlement in Laos. And we urge all the other states taking part in the talks in Geneva to do the same. Our position stems from the concept that if one really seeks peace, not war, then relations between states with different social systems should be built on the basis of peaceful coexistence.

Our talks with President Kennedy revealed the fact that we understand the peaceful coexistence of states differently. The President's idea is to build up some sort of dam against the peoples' movements to establish in their countries social systems which the ruling circles of the Western powers deem unsuitable.

If one takes such a view, then one must conclude an agreement and assume obligations to control other states, to prevent any changes of existing systems there, even if the peoples rebel against these systems. It turns out that if the people of a country want to change their social and political system, this should not be allowed.

Naturally this is an absolutely wrong concept, and we of course cannot agree with it. It is in no one's power to halt the peoples' wish for freedom. All regimes which are built on the oppression and exploitation of peoples are unstable and cannot exist forever; and no matter how cunningly the system of exploitation and oppression is built, the peoples will still win freedom and overthrow the oppressors. The changing of the social and political life of society is an inevitable process. It does not depend on agreement between statesmen. If anyone should display such folly and seek to get agreement on this question, he would thereby display his own worthlessness and lack of understanding of the events and the changes taking place in the world.

It is impossible to erect an obstacle in the path of the peoples' movement to progress, to a better life. This has been proven by the entire course of human development. At one time there existed slavery; it was replaced by feudalism, and then its place was taken by capitalism. One system replaced another because the new system was more progressive.

One could cite the example of the United States itself which emerged in the struggle against the colonial yoke of Britain. The American people waged a bitter liberation struggle and won independence by force of arms. At one time the United States considered such a course of events normal, yet now when the peoples rise to struggle against reactionary regimes, against their oppressors, the United States tries to interfere in the affairs of these countries to preserve the old regimes.

The representatives of imperialist states want to find a way to prevent ideas of liberation, the ideas of Marxism-Leninism from spreading further. When the people of a capitalist or colonial

country, displaying their discontent with the existing system, seek to change it, to establish a new system corresponding to their interests, then the governments of the imperialist countries immediately announce that it is communist scheming, the hand of Moscow, and so on. They are not averse to using such fabrications as a pretext for interfering in the domestic affairs of other countries.

Imperialist states' assistance to reactionary forces in other countries is fraught with great danger and could lead to great complications. The Soviet people and other freedom-loving peoples firmly stand for noninterference in the domestic affairs of any country. This is an essential condition for ensuring peace. Every people has the right to independence and free national existence, and no state should interfere in the internal affairs of other countries. A class struggle is under way in the capitalist countries. The peoples are fighting against their oppressors, against reactionary regimes. It is impossible to regulate these processes by agreement. He who would like to reach an agreement on this question would only show that he does not understand history, does not understand the laws of the development of society.

We believe that the most important thing that the Western powers, and particularly the United States, should recognize is that socialism is now firmly established in the world and it is in no one's power to change this fact. It is common knowledge that the ruling circles of the Western powers have in the past—and now too—harbored plans for abolishing the socialist system. But these attempts failed in the past and will fail again. It is essential to proceed from the fact of the existence in the world of two social systems and to build relations between the socialist and capitalist systems in such a way as to ensure peaceful cooperation between them. This is the only sensible path to be taken in relations between states to secure peace.

That is what I wanted to say, comrades, about our talks with the President of the United States. I must point out that on the whole I am pleased with these talks. If you were to ask me, was it worthwhile negotiating this meeting, was it worth holding, I would reply without hesitation: this meeting was worthwhile; moreover, it was necessary.

In our talks with the President of the United States neither side evaded bringing up and discussing the most acute questions. It

can be said that we had frank talks. We listened with attention to the position of the United States Government and set out in detail the position of the Soviet Government on a number of major international problems. That in itself is quite important. Of course no one thought that we would reach complete agreement—after all, the paths followed by our two countries are far too divergent to expect that. But I have the impression that President Kennedy understands the great responsibility that lies with the governments of two such powerful states. I should like to hope that the awareness of this responsibility will remain in the future, so that outstanding international problems may be solved, so that the rocks that bar the way to a stable peace, to better relations between the Soviet Union and the United States of America may be removed.

At present, relations between our countries leave much to be desired, and this situation has developed through no fault of the Soviet Union. But we would like to believe that there will come a time when Soviet-American relations will improve, and this will have a favorable influence on the entire international situation.

In Vienna we worked according to what might be called a packed timetable. The realization that we represented the great Soviet Union lent us energy and made our task easier. We knew that our Leninist foreign policy enjoys the wholehearted support of the Soviet people, of the peoples of the socialist countries.

The sympathies of hundreds of millions of people the world over are on our side.

The Soviet Government will continue to implement in all consistency the Leninist policy of peaceful coexistence, the policy of strengthening peace and friendship between peoples.

Thank you, dear comrades.

Good-by. Good night.

SPEECH BY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT A MOSCOW
PUBLIC MEETING MARKING THE TWENTIETH
ANNIVERSARY OF THE BEGINNING OF
WORLD WAR II (JUNE 21, 1961)

DEAR COMRADES:

Twenty years have elapsed since the day that fascist Germany perfidiously, without a declaration of war, attacked the Soviet Union, interrupted the peaceful labor of the Soviet people, and thrust a difficult, devastating war upon us.

The entire Soviet people rose in defense of their great homeland, in defense of the achievements of socialism. A sacred people's war against the nazi invasion began. The gigantic forces, the unbending will of the Soviet people closely rallied behind their own Communist Party became manifest in all their greatness during this war.

In his report, the Minister of Defense, Marshal of the Soviet Union Comrade Rodion Yakovlevich Malinovsky, and other comrades who spoke here, found fine words to describe the immortal exploit of the Soviet people, of our gallant armed forces in the Patriotic War. Again and again we turn to the events of World War II, because the war itself and the period preceding it enable the peoples to derive highly instructive lessons.

Way back, at the time Hitler and the German fascists were striving to seize power, our Party and the Soviet Government resolutely exposed the predatory nature of fascism and warned the peoples of the danger threatening them. The Soviet Union was the only state which tirelessly called for curbing fascism, for preventing it from unleashing another world war. The voices of Soviet representatives rang out loud in the League of Nations and at antiwar congresses, persistently urging a rebuff to fascism and unity for the struggle against the approaching disaster of war. The Soviet Government suggested concrete measures for safeguarding the security of peoples. It submitted

to the League of Nations a proposal for general and complete disarmament; it offered a collective security system which, if accepted, would have tied the hands of the fascist aggressors.

On the Eve of World War II

When direct danger of war confronted the world, the Soviet Government addressed France with a proposal to come out jointly against Hitler Germany in defense of Czechoslovakia. We also tried to reach agreement with the bourgeois governments of Poland and Rumania permitting our troops to cross their territories to help Czechoslovakia.

But the ruling quarters of the bourgeois states, blinded by hatred for our socialist country and afraid of the world revolutionary movement, did not accept any one of the Soviet Government's proposals though their advisability was obvious to all.

The entire prehistory of World War II is a disgraceful chapter in the policy of the so-called Western democracies. The ruling quarters of Britain, France, Poland and other states did not balk at betraying the national interests of their peoples. Mankind will never forget the disgraceful Munich collusion of 1938 when the rulers of Britain and France threw the Czechoslovak Republic at the feet of the fascist invaders. The peoples had to pay for this traitorous policy with the lives of millions of their sons and daughters and with terrible privation.

Recall the history of the dispatch of the British and French military missions to Moscow in the summer of 1939. The Soviet Government then suggested absolutely concrete plans for joint actions by the armed forces of the Three Powers in the event that Germany provoked a war in Europe. At that time it would not yet have been too late to halt the aggressor. Had the ruling quarters of Britain and France at that time expressed the desire and the will to rebuff the aggressor, Hitler would have thought more than twice before unleashing the war. History might have taken quite a different turn. There might have been no world war. Mankind would not have sustained such tremendous sacrifices and losses.

The Soviet Government at that time saw through the perfidy of the imperialist quarters which, conniving with the aggressor, wanted to crush the Soviet Union by means of Hitler's war

machine. We understood that by their policy of flirting with Hitler the Western Powers pursued only one aim—to spearhead German aggression against the Soviet Union. It was clear to us that German fascism acted as the mailed fist of world reaction, which was dreaming of crushing our country—the stronghold of the international revolutionary movement.

The Western Powers had a far-reaching scheme—to destroy the Soviet Union and at the same time to weaken Germany in order to have undivided domination over the world, and to dictate their own terms to everyone. This scheme was expressed most cynically by Harry Truman, a former Senator, and later President of the United States of America. He said: “If we see that Germany is winning, we ought to help Russia; and if Russia is winning, we ought to help Germany; and that way let them kill as many as possible . . .”

Such a policy, the essence of which was so bluntly set forth by Truman, was carried through by the Western Powers. These ideas are still alive in the minds of the aggressive imperialist quarters of the West. They are not averse to trying this once again if they find a force they can push against the Soviet Union.

But now there is no such force. The might of the Soviet Union and the entire socialist camp has grown so much that if the Western Powers mobilized all their forces in an insane attempt to liquidate the achievements of the peoples of the socialist countries, even then they would suffer a complete fiasco.

Even the representatives of the imperialist powers themselves now say that a balance of power between the Western states and the socialist countries has now been established in the world. The understanding of this represents progress on their part. But this progress would be even greater if those who understand the situation this way would actually conduct a policy in keeping with the present balance of power, that is, a policy of peace and peaceful coexistence.

The Soviet-German Nonaggression Pact

On the eve of World War II, the so-called Western democracies conducted a double-faced policy, and the Soviet Government understood that they did not want to join efforts with the Soviet Union against the fascist countries, Germany and Italy, that they

sought to prod nazi Germany against our country. Then the Soviet Government had no other recourse but to enter into negotiations with Hitler, although it realized that it was striking a deal with the devil incarnate.

It was the perfidious policy of the ruling circles of Britain and France that impelled us to conclude a nonaggression pact with Germany in August 1939. We could not act otherwise. We had to prevent the establishment of a united anti-Soviet front of the imperialist powers and give our people a peaceful breathing spell.

Later events showed the nearsightedness of the policy of the Western countries' governments and the soundness of the position of the Soviet Union.

World War II

The first blow of Hitler Germany fell upon the Western countries. But they offered such weak resistance that Hitler, after routing them one by one and without exhausting his forces, returned to his main aim—the attack on the Soviet Union. In the war against the Soviet Union the German imperialists pursued not only predatory but also class objectives—to destroy the first socialist state in the world. They expected to attain their aim within a short time and with little loss of blood. This is precisely how the well-known Barbarossa Plan was drawn up under which the Nazis expected to overrun our country even before the end of autumn of 1941.

But the calculations of the German militarists were one thing and reality was quite another. Our armed forces, the whole Soviet people, gave an heroic rebuff to the invaders. The war assumed a protracted nature, it became the bloodiest of all wars in history. It took a toll of many millions of lives; it brought unbelievable suffering to the peoples. Enormous material values created by the labor of many generations perished in the flames of war, but the people withstood the trial of this war and routed fascist Germany. Hitler had to shoot himself, and other fascist ringleaders who did not commit suicide were tried.

But many war criminals—as for instance Heusinger, Speidel and Foertsch—succeeded in escaping punishment. Now, far from having any qualms of conscience for their black deeds, they

succeeded in getting recognition of their "services" from our former allies and occupy commanding posts in NATO. Apparently the ruling quarters of the Western Powers profited little from the lessons of the past.

Proposal for a German Peace Treaty

Sixteen years have already elapsed since the end of the war, but so far no peace treaty has been concluded with Germany. Every sober-minded man and woman knows that people striving for peace end a war by signing a peace treaty and create all conditions for ending the state of war at the earliest possible date. The Western Powers do not want to end the war by signing a peace treaty, which would be the normal thing to do. They strive to preserve the state of war with Germany. What for? For peace? Certainly not. When peaceful settlement is artificially delayed—more than that, when those who propose to conclude a peace treaty are threatened with war, the peoples must treat the situation seriously. They must block the way of those who push matters toward the unleashing of a third world war in which not scores but hundreds of millions of people may die.

Who is interested in the absence of a German peace treaty, what forces are preventing its conclusion?

Certainly not the German people or the peoples of Europe who experienced the horrors of two world wars within the past few decades. The conclusion of a peace treaty is opposed by those forces in West Germany which think of revenge and are hatching plans for new military gambles. But it is clear to everyone that what matters is not only the Bonn militarists and surviving Hitlerites. The schemes of the revenge-seekers are encouraged and supported by the ruling quarters of the Western Powers.

Having ended the war, the peoples of the countries of the anti-Hitler coalition hoped and believed that Germany, the initiator of the two world wars, would never again become a hotbed of militarism and aggression.

And what do we have in fact? West Germany has now become an influential member of the aggressive military NATO bloc. Hitler's generals not only command the Bundeswehr but also hold key posts in the NATO command; they are in command of French and British soldiers whose fathers fought and

died in battles against the nazi invaders. In France and Britain, with the consent of the governments of these countries, units of West German troops are being instructed and trained for new campaigns. Militarists of the Federal Republic of Germany have already gotten hold of rocket weapons and are insistently demanding atomic weapons for the Bundeswehr.

Recently we discussed all these questions in detail with the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, in Vienna.

We explained to him in detail why the conclusion of a German peace treaty can no longer be delayed indefinitely. This treaty must put a seal on the situation which has arisen since World War II. Essentially we want nothing else. The position of the Soviet Government on this question is known to all the world. It was stated comprehensively in the memorandum which was handed to the United States President and later published in the press.

I dwelt in detail on the German question in my recent radio and television speech and, I believe, there is no need to expound our proposals again in all the details.

What is the Western reaction to our position?

The proposals of the Soviet Government attracted great interest and evoked broad response in all countries. All people who are interested in strengthening peace recognize the need for solving the question of a peace treaty with Germany, realize that this question is not only ripe but even overripe. They support our proposals which are aimed at a peaceful settlement of the German problem and which offer a good basis for this.

At the same time one must say that the ruling circles of the Western Powers still oppose the conclusion of a German peace treaty and would like to turn the German question into a touchstone for a test of strength.

Today I should like to warn those who, like Chancellor Adenauer, call for "standing firm" or even threaten to "give a rebuff" in reply to the Soviet Union's peaceful proposals.

On more than one occasion we reminded the leaders of the Federal Republic of Germany about the merits of reason. Is it possible, gentlemen, that you have forgotten the inglorious experience of your predecessors and would like to repeat it? You may try to repeat it, of course. But that would be the begin-

ning of your end. Times are not now what they were twenty years ago. Now, not only German revenge-seekers, but all those who would try to support them in a new adventure against us would share the fate of Hitler.

These words should not be taken as a threat. They are an appeal to reason. It is high time that it is finally understood that the Soviet Union is different now, that the world is different, and that the balance of forces and armaments is different.

Therefore, Mr. Chancellor, do not try to frighten us with your "firmness." You say that if we conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic (GDR), you will stop at nothing. This indicates only the weakness of your position.

Everybody knows that we do not want war. But if you really threaten us with war, we are not afraid of such a threat. If you do touch off a war, that will be suicide for you.

It goes without saying that some unreasonable person may commit suicide. His relations will weep over him, but humanity will not suffer from that. But when statesmen invested with high authority are playing with fire, are threatening to plunge their country into the maelstrom of war, at stake are not only their lives but also the destiny of the peoples. By dragging West Germany into an adventure, you are pushing the people of your country toward suicide.

The Soviet people do not want war, and for just this reason we strive to remove what can cause its outbreak. For the sake of this, at the end of this year, we together with other peace-loving states, will sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

It is not war, not an alliance of some countries against others for the purpose of building up forces for war that the Soviet Union is offering. We want one thing only—lasting peace. It is for the purpose of strengthening peace that it is essential to conclude a peace treaty and thus eliminate the remnants of World War II. This we openly proclaim and we want one and all to understand us correctly. The Soviet Union wants to sign a peace treaty with Germany together with our former allies.

Contrary to the noisy ravings of those who would like to keep up international tension, we do not threaten West Berlin at all when we urge the conclusion of a peace treaty. We should

like sincerely to come to terms on this question, too, with those countries with which we fought together against Hitler Germany and have common commitments with regard to Germany.

A Free-City Status for West Berlin

We propose a free-city status for West Berlin. We have no intention of changing the social and political system in West Berlin. This is the internal concern of its population. Neither the Soviet Union nor the German Democratic Republic intends to restrict the links between West Berlin and all the countries of the world. In conformity with international law, however, there must be respect for the sovereign rights of the German Democratic Republic, across whose territory run the communications connecting West Berlin with the outer world.

On the question of West Berlin the governments of the United States, Britain and France adhere to the positions of yesterday. Even Western political leaders have to admit this. Mansfield, the Democratic majority leader in the United States Senate, declared in his speech of June 14, 1961, that he could not agree with the position of the Kennedy administration, which fails to recognize the enormous changes that have occurred since the war in both parts of Germany and in Europe and which is fraught with the danger of a nuclear war. He stressed that it is not courageous to stand stubbornly on untenable positions but it is better to seek agreement with other parties concerned on a businesslike basis. This is a correct approach and we can only welcome it. Senator Mansfield does not deny that with appropriate international guarantees the free-city idea is the most suitable under the present conditions. He has suggested that the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) and the GDR sign such an agreement and make their contribution to its realization.

It is true that Mansfield then loses his sense of reality. He demands that the free-city status be applied not only to West Berlin but also to democratic Berlin, which is known to be an integral part of the sovereign German Democratic Republic, its capital. Why further complicate the task of normalizing the situation in West Berlin, difficult as it is?

The Soviet Union proposes that in the search for a solution the *de facto* and *de jure* situation now obtaining be taken as a

point of departure. No one demands that the existing way of life of the West Berlin population be changed, no one is going to intervene in its affairs. But the Soviet Union is not to be expected to agree to an infringement of the territorial integrity of the German Democratic Republic, or of her sovereignty.

We propose that such a peace treaty be concluded with Germany as would not infringe on the rights and interests of any of the sides, would not give some states an advantage over others. The Soviet Union only proposes to record what has long since taken shape and exists in reality. We propose *de jure* consolidation of the existing frontiers of Germany.

It is possible that the present frontiers do not please the West German revanchists, but they have only themselves to blame. It was not we who began the war for a revision of frontiers. The present frontiers of Germany took shape as a result of the defeat of nazi Germany, as a result of the defeat of those who had unleashed a predatory war. The new frontiers restored historic justice which had been violated by the forerunners of the present-day German militarists.

We are told that the peace treaty we are going to conclude with the German Democratic Republic will be a separate treaty. In my radio and television speech I have already said that the United States of America, while signing a peace treaty with Japan, did not take us into consideration though we had been its allies in the war against Japan. Thus it showed that it regarded itself entitled to sign a treaty without us, though our rights, as one of the victorious countries, were irrefutable.

Now we, in turn, want to exercise in the German question the same rights which the United States and its friends exercised in the Japanese question. We follow suit, no more.

As regards those who try to threaten us with war if we sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, they will bear the entire responsibility for their actions.

I should like to repeat that all sober-minded people, no matter how embittered they are against communism, against the Soviet Union, must understand that we now live in 1961 and not in 1941. We have all the necessary means of defense. And we shall use these means not for attack but only in order to defend our homeland, the peaceful life of the Soviet people, the peoples

of all socialist countries, who together with us stand on positions of peace and uphold it against the machinations of the West German revanchists and their patrons.

The Problem of General and Complete Disarmament

Comrades, the indomitable might of socialism was fully manifested in the Great Patriotic War. The Soviet Union bore the brunt of the struggle against Hitler Germany which by the time it attacked our country had conquered most of the countries of Europe.

We have always said that we achieved victory over fascism jointly with our allies in the anti-Hitler coalition. The Soviet people duly appreciate the assistance rendered them in the course of the war by the United States of America, Britain and other countries. I believe, however, that our former allies themselves understand that the decisive contribution to victory was made by the Soviet people, and we in no way belittle their merits and efforts when we recall the selfless heroism of the Soviet people.

All decisive battles of World War II were fought on the Eastern front. While the United States of America lost in World War II approximately 300,000 men and Britain approximately 250,000, on our front such losses were sustained in individual battles. There is hardly a single family in our country which did not suffer from the war. Our people lost many millions of their finest sons and daughters.

Yes, it was a very hard struggle, but the Soviet Union stood the test. Not only did it stand the test, but it emerged from the ordeal of World War II even stronger than before.

Within a brief space of time the Soviet people repaired all the war damage. Now even our sworn enemies admit that the Soviet Union is one of the strongest powers militarily. Besides, the Soviet Union is not alone now. We live and work within a great community of socialist countries whose population exceeds one billion.

Unleashing World War II, the imperialists hoped to bury socialism. But actually it was the fascism of Hitler and Mussolini that was buried under the war ruins, while socialism has become even more firmly rooted in the world. We Communists believe in the triumph of the great ideas of Marxism and Len-

inism, in the name of which the Soviet people fought during the years of World War II, sparing neither effort nor life itself. And it is because we believe in our ideas that we, now as before, stand for peace and international friendship, and fight for general disarmament.

As far back as 1922, on Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's instructions, the Soviet delegation to the Geneva conference came out with a disarmament proposal. In 1927 the Soviet Union submitted its disarmament proposals to the League of Nations. Since World War II the Soviet Union has been pressing for the solution of the disarmament problem with even greater persistence. In 1959, on behalf of the Soviet Government, I submitted to the United Nations a full-scale plan for general and complete disarmament under strict international control. We firmly stand by this position because we sincerely want disarmament, which is essential for ensuring peace to all people.

In our plea for disarmament, for peace and security of peoples, for peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, we proceed from the idea that the government and social system of any country in the internal concern of its people and that no one may impose any particular social order upon it.

The monopoly capital bosses who determine the policy of the Western Powers, naturally, have a conception of state and socio-political structure which is diametrically opposed to ours. They want to perpetuate the capitalist system at all costs, to preserve the system existing in their countries under which the strong plunders the weak, the rich exploits the poor and appropriates the fruits of his labor. The socialist countries are developing on a different foundation. In socialist society all people are really equal because we have no capitalists and no proletarians; each member of the society discharges his definite social function, working for the good of the whole people and therefore for his own good. The higher production rises, the richer our country becomes, the richer becomes our entire society; and every member of this society enjoys the benefits of social labor. In the socialist society all are equal, and this equality in our country is real and not formal, as is the case in the so-called "free world," where the strong are free to plunder and oppress the weak.

Such are the opposing concepts of the two worlds—the capi-

talist world and the socialist world. There will never be a reconciliation between them, and it is our firm conviction that the socialist concept, as the more progressive one, will prevail over the capitalist concept. But we stress again and again: the social system is the business of the people of each country, and this question must be decided by the people itself without external interference.

The Soviet Government is doing everything in its power to ensure peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, to see to it that they not only coexist without war but also closely cooperate, maintaining brisk, businesslike trade, and cultural, scientific and other contacts.

It is to ensure lasting peace that we wage the struggle for disarmament. Although the Western Powers, particularly the United States, stubbornly reject disarmament under one pretext or another, we shall insist on our proposals again and again, we will strive persistently to make all people understand the need for solving the disarmament problem, because this is in the interests of the people.

The ruling circles of the capitalist countries lack the courage to say openly that they are against disarmament. They pretend that they are ready to negotiate, express readiness to sit endlessly on various committees and subcommittees. The endless meetings on disarmament that were held in the sixteen years since the end of World War II have not pushed this matter a single step forward.

Representatives of countries of monopoly capital go to disarmament talks for the sole purpose of misleading their peoples, of lulling them with hope for agreement, but actually they are sabotaging disarmament, are continuing the feverish arms race. And they would like to do this so cunningly as to put the blame for sabotaging agreement upon the socialist countries. For this purpose bourgeois diplomacy and propaganda are hard at work spreading the fabrication that we propose disarmament without control and thus prevent agreement on disarmament.

We have exposed this machination. We have declared in the United Nations: gentlemen, if you want agreement—not in words but in deeds—accept our proposals for complete disarmament, and then we shall accept any of your proposals on control.

The enemies of disarmament have nothing to say to that. They have only one path open to them: to mislead the peoples and to repeat endlessly the fable that we stand for disarmament without control. But, as the saying goes, lies have short legs and one cannot get far on them!

In conditions wherein the governments of the Western Powers stubbornly sabotage disarmament, the solution of this vital problem entirely depends upon the peoples. All peoples must realize the seriousness of the present situation and bring pressure to bear on those governments obstructing the solution of the disarmament problem—the most important problem of our time.

The working people, intellectuals, all people who want peace, can and must compel the governments of capitalist countries to accept disarmament. If this is not done, the imperialist circles may bring the peoples to a war and then it will be too late to look for the culprits. Modern war has its own inexorable law—mass extermination of people, destruction of all material values.

I speak about this in all seriousness to make plain to all the importance of active struggle for disarmament, on the outcome of which the future of mankind will depend in many respects. As to the Soviet Union, the people of all countries may rest assured that it will not be found wanting. We are ready to sign even tomorrow an agreement on general and complete disarmament with any, with the strictest international control.

A Nuclear Weapons Test Ban

But we shall not accept control without disarmament, because such control would in effect be espionage. In this connection I should like to say a few words on the question of a nuclear weapons test ban. At the Geneva talks the Western Powers have taken a position which does not make it possible to reach agreement to end these tests.

In its recent memorandum the Soviet Government has proposed an interdependent solution of the problem of ending nuclear weapons tests and of general and complete disarmament. The other day the United States Government sent us a memorandum rejecting our proposal. We shall reply to the White House memorandum. But I am now already in a position to say that we firmly stand by the views we have stated.

For close to three years the Soviet Union has been making no nuclear weapons tests, although we have no treaty with the Western Powers on this matter. We can continue abstaining from nuclear tests and offer to the Western Powers to reach agreement on the disarmament problem as a whole and on its component parts, including the question of nuclear weapons tests.

Some American leaders urge the United States Government to resume nuclear weapons tests if the Soviet Union does not accept the Western Powers' demands.

What can be said about such threats? They will frighten no one but merely expose the unreasonableness of those who resort to them. We must warn these gentlemen: no sooner does the United States resume nuclear explosions than the Soviet Union will start testing its nuclear weapons. Quite a few devices which need practical testing have been developed in the Soviet Union. This testing, of course, will increase the fighting power of our armed forces and enable us to develop even better atomic and nuclear bombs and improve the technology of their manufacture. If in reply to the resumption of nuclear tests by the Western Powers we did not start testing our weapons, we would damage the defense potential of our country and of the entire socialist community.

Thus the entire responsibility for the resumption of nuclear weapons tests will rest with the governments of the Western Powers.

The Soviet Union is persistently pursuing a policy of peace, of peaceful coexistence of states with different social systems, a policy of noninterference of some states in the internal affairs of others. In negotiations with its partners the Soviet Union is pressing for the conclusion of an agreement on general and complete disarmament under the strictest control, an agreement banning nuclear weapons.

Steadily pursuing our peaceloving foreign policy, we have always maintained that question of the social and political system of states, questions of class struggle and of changing the system within a given country are the concern of the people of each state.

The Soviet foreign policy has earned the recognition and trust

of the peoples, and we are proud of this. The Soviet Union, the countries of socialism, are making tremendous efforts to preserve world peace, are seeking a peaceful settlement of disputed and unsolved questions in international relations.

The Soviet Union, possessing tremendous economic and military might, has never used and will not use its strength for aggressive purposes. On the contrary, it directs all its efforts toward ensuring peace.

All Must Act to End the Arms Race

Comrades, I am proud of the high award bestowed upon me—the Lenin Prize for the Promotion of Peace among Nations.

I have already said that I regard this prize not only as recognition of my personal efforts as the head of the Government of the Soviet Union but also as recognition of the efforts of all peoples of our country in their persistent struggle for the strengthening of peace.

It is often said in our press that Khrushchev is a peace champion, that he will ensure world peace, and so on. This is flattering, of course, But to pin hopes on one country, on one person, even if he stands at the head of the government of such a country as the Soviet Union, and to expect that they alone can ensure peace while others are inactive, means to do a service not to peace but to the forces of aggression, the forces of war.

Life shows that to win world peace, it is not enough to rely on the efforts of any single country. It is not enough to find “heroes” of some sort and rely on them to ensure peace. In order to ensure enduring peace on earth it is essential for the peoples of our entire planet to make an all-out effort to strengthen peace. The peoples, and the peoples alone, can force the governments which resist disarmament, which build up stocks of arms in order to unleash war, to desist from such a dangerous and unreasonable policy.

Peace can be ensured only when the peoples of each country do not rely on other countries but launch within their own country an irreconcilable struggle against the forces which stand for war, make an all-out effort to ensure peace.

All the peoples want peace, peaceful coexistence. Only a handful of imperialists, representatives of monopoly capital, a handful

of aggressive revenge-seekers in West Germany, are of a different opinion. But the trouble is that representatives of these circles hold commanding positions in the Western countries, occupy key posts in governments and determine the policy of the Western countries.

That is why no people that really does not want the terrible conflagration of the most devastating war to break out on earth can stay aloof from the common struggle for peace. The peoples should realize that only they can and must compel their governments to renounce the dangerous policy aimed at fanning war passion and the arms race, can and must render harmless those people who conduct a policy of building up aggressive forces, the policy of preparing war.

The Soviet Government and our people must closely follow the trends in the international situation. It is well-known that the Soviet Union went to great lengths to achieve a relaxation of international tension. Our government has submitted a proposal on general and complete disarmament which has found enthusiastic response and support in all countries of the world. We have dismantled all our military bases abroad. The Soviet Union has repeatedly cut its armed forces on a unilateral basis.

However, the Western Powers with which we are negotiating disarmament have not reciprocated, have not adopted the path of reducing their armed forces. Far from that, the United States this year is increasing appropriations for armaments by close to two and a half billion dollars over the past year. At present in the United States they are discussing the question of increasing the numerical strength of the armed forces. They are busy establishing so-called guerrilla detachments which are to be dispatched to other countries to suppress liberation movements, to fight against governments and state systems which do not suit the imperialist Western circles. These detachments are being trained for murder, sabotage, subversion.

Chancellor Adenauer is demanding nuclear weapons for the Bundeswehr. It goes without saying that it is not for play that West German militarists want to have nuclear weapons but for revanchist adventures that they are planning against the Soviet Union, the socialist countries and other states.

Naturally such measures of the Western Powers are not de-

signed to improve the international climate, to reach agreement on disarmament but to aggravate relations between states, to whip up the cold war. We must take a sober view of the situation, be vigilant, so that the enemies of socialism, the aggressive militaristic circles do not catch us unawares.

We must make every effort to strengthen still more the might of our homeland; to raise still higher our economy, science and technology; to raise the living and cultural standards of the people.

Now, as before, we must be tireless in our concern for the armed forces of our country, which stand guard over the gains of the October Revolution, the gains of socialism. Our armed forces must always be ready to ensure dependably the security of the Soviet Union, must have all that is needed to smash immediately any enemy who dares to encroach on the freedom of our homeland. May those who harbor aggressive designs against the Soviet Union and other socialist countries know what their fate will be if they touch off a war and attack.

The Soviet Government is doing everything in its power to end the arms race, to relieve the people of the grave burden of war expenditures. Unfortunately, the imperialist powers respond by increasing military appropriations, by increasing the numerical strength of their armed forces. This might make it imperative for the Soviet Union likewise to increase appropriations for armaments, to strengthen and improve our defenses, and, if need be, also to increase the numerical strength of our armed forces, so as to ensure peace and peaceful coexistence, relying on our might.

Dear comrades, allow me on behalf of the Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government to greet our valiant armed forces, which stand guard over the constructive labor of the Soviet people. We warmly greet the men of the Army and Navy—sergeants and petty officers, officers, generals and admirals—and wish them great success in their noble military duty.

The strengthening of the Soviet Union's defenses depends on the perfection of all the services of our Armed Forces—infantry and artillery, engineering and communications troops, armored units and the Navy, the Air and Rocket Forces.

In our time exceptionally great is the responsibility of the rocket forces, especially of units which service ballistic rockets of various ranges, from tactical to intercontinental. Their combat readiness and training must be of the highest level because very much depends on rocket forces.

It is their crushing power that is the prime deterrent which keeps any potential aggressor from attacking us and our allies. Their capability for striking in retaliation is the force which will inexorably punish the aggressor, if nevertheless he dares to commit an act of madness and touches off a new war.

Today, on the twentieth anniversary of the treacherous attack of Hitler Germany on the Soviet Union, we think of those who gave their lives for the freedom and independence of the great Soviet homeland. Never will the great exploit of the glorious soldiers of the Soviet Army, of navy men, of valiant partisans—men and women—who died the death of the brave in battles against fascist invaders be erased from the memory of the people. Forever shall we remember the millions of peaceful Soviet people who perished in this terrible war. There is no family in our country which did not lose a husband or son, a brother or father, a daughter or sister.

Comrades, I ask you to stand in memory of those who fell in battle against the fascist invaders, for the freedom and independence of our homeland.

Tremendous were the sacrifices made by our people in defending the freedom and independence of our homeland. These were sacrifices in the name of a great noble cause. And now, twenty years after the outbreak of the Great Patriotic War, sixteen years after it ended, our country has reached unparalleled heights in the development of its economy, culture, science and technology, and is firmly marching onward to new victories.

We are proud that the Soviet people, led by the Communist Party under the banner of Marxism-Leninism, were the first to accomplish a socialist revolution and usher in a new era in the history of humanity. The great founders of scientific communism blazed the first paths to a better life. And now these paths have turned into the main road of all humanity, along which the peoples of many countries are advancing victoriously.

The Soviet people, having built socialism, are confidently

marching along the road of building communism. The draft program of our Party, approved the other day by a plenary meeting of the Party's Central Committee and which will be published for universal discussion, outlines a broad front for the comprehensive upbuilding of communism, for the realization of the age-old dream of all mankind. It has been our great fortune to participate in this lofty cause.

Long live the Soviet people, the victorious people!

Long live the valiant Armed Forces of the Soviet Union!

Long live the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the organizer and inspirer of all our victories!

Long live world peace!

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH
AT A SOVIET-VIETNAMESE FRIENDSHIP MEETING
IN MOSCOW (JUNE 28, 1961)*

Disarmament with Strict International Control

Comrades, all peoples strive for durable peace. They want neither the cold nor the hot war. The Soviet Government is doing everything to strengthen peace on earth. We have proposed a cardinal solution of the disarmament problem—to disband all national armies; to destroy all existing stockpiles of weapons; to discontinue armaments production everywhere; that is, to carry out general and complete disarmament under international control.

The discontinuance of atomic and hydrogen weapon tests, on which the Western countries now center their attention, does not in itself solve the problem. The Soviet Union is against any nuclear explosions. Our government has always been and remains in favor of an international agreement banning nuclear tests under strict and equal international control. The conclusion of such an agreement is obstructed by the refusal of our American and British partners in negotiations to take the Soviet interests into account.

I would like to say once again that the discontinuation of nuclear weapon tests in itself will not rid the peoples of the threat of a devastating war. General and complete disarmament would be a cardinal solution.

The Soviet Union is prepared to start at any time the practical realization of complete disarmament. We suggest that disarmament be carried out under the strictest international control, which would guarantee exact fulfillment of the disarmament program by all states. We have no use for control over arma-

*Sections of this speech dealing with Vietnam and other problems of Southeast Asia have been omitted—Ed.

ments without disarmament. The Soviet Government will not accept such control. We are in favor of general and complete disarmament under all-embracing and comprehensive control. The Soviet Government is prepared to accept any system of control over disarmament which the Western Powers may suggest; only let them agree to genuine disarmament.

Thus the Western Powers' contention that allegedly we are against control hold no water. Our partners in negotiation understand that we want control. More than that, the Soviet Government will not agree to disarmament without control.

They know this, but distort our position because they have not thought up any other arguments as yet. As a matter of fact, everything boils down to the unwillingness of certain Western quarters to abandon the policy of the arms race and the preparation of new military ventures. Only this can explain, too, the unwillingness of the Western Powers to promote a peaceful settlement with Germany which would ensure reliable stability and security in Europe.

Germany and the Consolidation of Peace in Europe

The Soviet Union proposes that all the countries of the anti-Hitlerite coalition, on the one hand, and the two German states, on the other, sign a peace treaty, thereby drawing a line through World War II. The past must not be allowed to interfere with the present-day life of the peoples, to hang like heavy weights on the legs of the peoples who wish to go forward. The militarist and revanchist forces must not be allowed to stir up the vestiges of World War II conflagrations, exposing Europe and all the world to the danger of a new, still more destructive war.

The Soviet Government moves to safeguard the postwar boundaries in Europe from the encroachments of revanchists and to improve the situation in West Berlin. We propose that the commitment of Germans never to encroach upon the independence, freedom and sovereignty of other nations and to live with them in peace and friendship without resorting to force or to the threat of force be recorded in an international document. The peace treaty will not place any country in a privileged position with regard to another. It will conform in equal measure to the interests of all states.

There are some rash heads in the West who obviously lose their balance at the prospect of the consolidation of peace in Europe. The Western press raises much noise about the proposal for concluding a peace treaty and solving on this basis the West Berlin issue. Some people suggest that economic sanctions be used if a peace treaty is concluded; that is, to discontinue trade with us. Trade is a purely voluntary business. Everyone trades if it is beneficial for him. If it is disadvantageous for the West, it is free to take any decision. Threats of discontinuing trade cannot, of course, prevent us from signing a German peace treaty.

Others even speak of breaking off diplomatic relations with us. There is nothing new in this either. The West has already tried to live without diplomatic relations with us and not even recognize the Soviet state. This venture has fallen through. It is not difficult to see that an even more scandalous failure awaits the authors of such a venture in our day.

The greatest hotheads urge that there be a call for mobilization and that other measures of a military nature be taken. Gentlemen, such measures have also been taken against us. We were not only threatened, but attempts were even made to break us by force. Our Red Army has been steeled in battles against the imperialist states. More than forty years ago we flinched neither before threats nor intervention and defeated the military ventures of the imperialists.

The Soviet Union defeated Hitler Germany, which was the mailed fist of world reaction. We have defended our freedom and independence in the struggle with numerous enemies. It would be absolutely senseless to expect that a policy of threats and force with regard to the Soviet Union could yield some sort of fruits for the imperialists.

Saber rattling, of course, is not a new thing and does not require much brains. The Soviet people will not be frightened by it and will not be stopped in their desire to do away with the vestiges of the last war and conclude a German peace treaty. The Soviet Union speaks with all nations in the language of reason and friendship. The argument of threats has long become outmoded and must be archived. It is high time to learn this lesson. But if a "positions of strength" language is imposed upon us, we shall have the means to answer. If the enemies of peace

and peaceful coexistence call a mobilization just the same, we shall not allow them to catch us unawares. We shall take the necessary measures and, if need be, take additional steps to strengthen our security.

We tell the lovers of war ventures: you are raising your hand against the people's right to live in peace, which they have won at the cost of many millions of lives in the struggle against fascism, and wish to legalize it in a German peace treaty. But you, gentlemen, will not be able to intimidate us—the peace treaty will be signed!

On the road to the easing of tension we shall apparently have to go through some "cooling" stage in Europe. It will be artificial cooling, because there are no weighty reasons for it. But apparently it is desired by international reaction and the revanchist forces in West Germany. The Western Powers cannot get out of the quicksand of brinkmanship into which Dulles and Eisenhower have led them. They stubbornly strive to pursue this fruitless policy today contrary to logic and common sense, contrary to their own interests.

The Western statesmen declare that the military strength of the capitalist and socialist camps is now balanced. But then a balanced international policy should be pursued, that is, relations should not be aggravated and threats should not be made. Unfortunately there are no signs of common sense in the Western policy, common sense which should stem from recognition of the obtaining correlation of forces in the world.

What is more, the forces are not equal: we hold that the forces of socialism and peace are much mightier than the forces of imperialism and war. We rely not only on our economic and military might, but we are backed by the righteous cause of our people, the truth of all the peoples and all states that abide by positions of peaceful coexistence and the peaceful solution of all disputed international questions. The conclusion of a German peace treaty is the most peaceful of all peaceful decisions.

It would seem that the Foreign Minister of West Germany von Brentano should also realize that today it is 1961 and not 1941. But he calls for the use of force, lies and is guided by the warlike ideas of his predecessor, von Ribbentrop, who was a "von" under Hitler. I shall not recall the sad end of this "von."

But is it not too early for the “von” under Adenauer to forget the end of his predecessor, von Ribbentrop?

Mr. von Brentano is making unwise, incendiary speeches. He is courting disaster for the German people and the other peoples of Europe and Asia, who are fed up with war. Brentano is striving to intimidate us but achieves quite the opposite. The calls of Bonn revanchists for force further strengthen our resolution to uphold the just cause of peace. The ruling quarters of the Federal Republic of Germany would like to perpetuate the postwar disaccommodation—not for peace, of course, but for building up forces and choosing a moment for unleashing a new military venture. In order to do away with this dangerous seat of war, the peaceloving nations are stubbornly striving for a German peace treaty.

The Western Powers are exerting great propaganda efforts to distort the essence of the Soviet proposals for a peaceful settlement in Germany. They speculate with particular frequency on the so-called right of the Germans to self-determination, striving to pose as champion of the national rights of the Germans.

Let us not stop to show how unconvincing such words are when they come from those who have done practically everything to undermine Germany's unity and then deepen the country's division.

The Reunification of Germany

It is well-known that the imperialist powers interpret the peoples' right to self-determination and the question of reunifying the divided nations as they wish.

When Germany is in question, they refer to the right of peoples to self-determination, demanding the reunification of Germany, although two states with different social-economic systems exist there. But despite this, they raise the question of reunification just the same because they hope that their ideas will triumph in a reunified Germany, inasmuch as the population of West Germany is much larger than that of the German Democratic Republic.

But what happens to their “abidance by principle” in upholding the right of peoples to self-determination and reunification

when it comes to other countries? We can refer, for instance, to the question of Vietnam's reunification. I have already said that under the 1954 international agreement general elections were to be held in Vietnam within a two-year period with a view to determining the further course of this nation's development. But the Western Powers, above all the United States, have done everything to preclude these elections. They have achieved this, and Vietnam is still divided into two parts. Why did the imperialists do this? Because they know that the people of South Vietnam have preserved their loyalty to democratic principles and, if given the right to express their will, they would doubtlessly come out for reunification with their brothers in North Vietnam on the same social-political basis as the one existing in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

After this, what is the value of the Western approach of principle to the question of national unification?

The right of nations to self-determination is a national question; Germany's unification in the present condition, however, is above all a social and class problem.

The Germans were divided because of the different development of separate parts of the former German Empire and the establishment of two states with different social-economic systems. A capitalist system exists in one state—the Federal Republic of Germany—and a socialist system, in the German Democratic Republic.

Unification of two states, even with a similar system, is far from an easy task. In any case it cannot be solved from the outside. A requisite for such unification must be the desire of the population to live in a single state, a definite unanimity of views and interests on basic internal and external problems.

What can be said then about the unification of states with different social systems? Is it not clear that their unification is a much more different matter, where dictation and attempts of subjecting one state to another are intolerable.

The unification of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany into a single state can be achieved only through talks and cooperation between the governments of these states themselves. The other nations must not interfere in this internal affair of the Germans.

The Government of the German Democratic Republic has proposed more than once to the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that they meet and negotiate ways for overcoming Germany's division. The German Democratic Republic has advanced the well-known proposal to set up a German confederation which would make possible the pooling of efforts by both German states on cardinal questions, common to all Germans.

But West Germany has refused, through Chancellor Adenauer, to conduct talks with the East Germans. It demands that the Great Powers reunify Germany, that they throw the German Democratic Republic back from positions of building socialism. This is swallowing up, and not reunifying. Do the militarist and revanchist forces of West Germany really think that this is possible to achieve with our aid, that is, with the help of the socialist states? They themselves can hardly believe such calculations to be practicable.

Socialist Germany exists and is developing. It is our ally and can always rely on our aid and support.

The Status of West Berlin

We are threatening nobody by proposing to conclude a German peace treaty and to solve, on this basis, the question of West Berlin. I wish to say once again that the social-economic order in West Berlin will remain just as its population wishes. We propose to establish reliable international guarantees of noninterference in the affairs of West Berlin: let the four Great Powers be the guarantors and keep some contingents of their armed forces in the free city, or such guarantees could be provided by the armed forces of neutral nations or the United Nations.

There will be no blockade of West Berlin and no obstacles will be put up on the routes of access to this city. West Berlin will be able to maintain free contacts with all states at its own discretion.

Since the communication lanes to West Berlin pass through the territory of the German Democratic Republic, agreement with the government of this state should be reached, consequently, on their use, as existing international traditions and

when it comes to other countries? We can refer, for instance, to the question of Vietnam's reunification. I have already said that under the 1954 international agreement general elections were to be held in Vietnam within a two-year period with a view to determining the further course of this nation's development. But the Western Powers, above all the United States, have done everything to preclude these elections. They have achieved this, and Vietnam is still divided into two parts. Why did the imperialists do this? Because they know that the people of South Vietnam have preserved their loyalty to democratic principles and, if given the right to express their will, they would doubtlessly come out for reunification with their brothers in North Vietnam on the same social-political basis as the one existing in the Democratic Republic of Vietnam.

After this, what is the value of the Western approach of principle to the question of national unification?

The right of nations to self-determination is a national question; Germany's unification in the present condition, however, is above all a social and class problem.

The Germans were divided because of the different development of separate parts of the former German Empire and the establishment of two states with different social-economic systems. A capitalist system exists in one state—the Federal Republic of Germany—and a socialist system, in the German Democratic Republic.

Unification of two states, even with a similar system, is far from an easy task. In any case it cannot be solved from the outside. A requisite for such unification must be the desire of the population to live in a single state, a definite unanimity of views and interests on basic internal and external problems.

What can be said then about the unification of states with different social systems? Is it not clear that their unification is a much more different matter, where dictation and attempts of subjecting one state to another are intolerable.

The unification of the German Democratic Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany into a single state can be achieved only through talks and cooperation between the governments of these states themselves. The other nations must not interfere in this internal affair of the Germans.

memorandum handed to President Kennedy in Vienna also says that we wish to achieve a solution of the German question in agreement with the Western Powers. This would be the best thing to do—to achieve the consolidation of peace in Europe, not through the straining of our relations but through the joint conclusion of a peace treaty.

I repeat: we are for talks with the Western Powers on the question of a peaceful settlement with Germany. We are ready to start talks in order to strive honestly and sincerely for an agreement and the conclusion of a peace treaty. But if anyone is calculating to involve us in endless talks with a view to freezing the question of the German peace treaty, these gentlemen are mistaken. It won't go with us.

There are quite a few sober voices in the West speaking in favor of the peaceful solution of the German problem with due regard for the obtaining situation in Europe.

I have read with great attention the article by British Field Marshal Montgomery. None, I think, will suspect the Field Marshal of being a communist mouthpiece. His anticommunist reputation is solid and recognized by everyone. But many of the things said by Lord Montgomery do not conflict with our arguments.

We, of course, cannot agree with certain theses of his article, but what he writes is, in the main, sensible. He proposes that all foreign troops be withdrawn from Europe to within their national boundaries, foreign war bases be dismantled, that foreign troops be evacuated from Berlin, and so on. This coincides with our proposals.

Nor is our position contradicted by Lord Montgomery's statement that the Federal Republic of Germany should have access to West Berlin. We believe that the Federal Republic of Germany, as all other states, can have diplomatic, economic and other relations with West Berlin. But we have never recognized and shall not recognize the claims of the ruling quarters of the Federal Republic of Germany, who assert, without any grounds, that West Berlin is a part of their republic.

Field Marshal Montgomery has in his time been Assistant Supreme Commander of the NATO Armed Forces in Europe. Therefore he has been one of the champions and executors of

the "positions of strength" policy. Today, as many other people who are able to judge and think soberly, he realizes whither the "positions of strength" policy leads.

It would be good if this were realized also by those who now shape Western policy. This would be a big step forward and would make possible the reaching of agreement among all the interested nations on a just and equitable basis.

Certain organs of the Western press claim that by its proposals on the German question the Soviet Union wishes to upset the obtaining equilibrium in Europe. It suffices to cast a cursory glance at the Soviet proposals in order to see that these assertions hold no water. We propose to legalize what has taken shape as a result of this war: to recognize the actual state of affairs in Europe and to conclude a peace treaty with the two German states.

Let West Germany, which is now a member of the NATO military alignment, remain in this bloc. Let the German Democratic Republic remain a member of the Warsaw Treaty organization, which the socialist states were compelled to conclude as a counterbalance to the North Atlantic bloc. Let the situation remain as it is until the sides reach agreement on the liquidation of military blocs.

The Soviet Union and its friends want one thing only—to consolidate peace and improve the atmosphere in Europe. We want nothing else, no acquisitions, no conquests. But no threats will stop us in our striving for peace. It is best that the Western gentlemen learn this once and for all.

We want peace and friendship with all the nations, regardless of the social system which exists in this or that state. We want peace and friendship with the United States, though the understanding of many questions in our two countries is diametrically opposite.

I have already said that my meeting and talks with United States President Kennedy in Vienna were useful inasmuch as they helped to achieve a better understanding of several important international questions. Such meetings will be useful in the future as well, because the problems arising in international relations cannot be solved without the meetings of government leaders. This can be achieved, of course, only when the states-

men strive to find mutually acceptable decisions for disputed questions through talks and not through the pursuance of a "position of strength" policy, a policy of war threats.

We came out and continue to come out for the expansion of contacts in different spheres between the Soviet Union and the Western Powers. We regard as useful the mutual visits of scientists, businessmen and workers in culture and art. We are ready to expand such contacts because they help people from different countries to get to know each other better. A useful discussion between Soviet newsmen and representatives of the American press took place on American television a few days ago. Our newsmen were afterward received by President Kennedy. We value highly the fact that President Kennedy has received our journalists and talked to them, just as somewhat earlier he had conversed with a large group of other Soviet journalists.

All these contacts contribute to the better understanding and improvement of relations between our two countries, and we want this line to continue in the future.

N. S. KHRUSHCHEV'S SPEECH
AT A KREMLIN RECEPTION FOR GRADUATES
OF MILITARY ACADEMIES (JULY 8, 1961)

DEAR COMRADES:

Today we mark the graduation by our military academies of a new detachment of highly skilled officers.

May I, on behalf of the Central Committee of our Party, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet, and the Soviet Government, heartily congratulate the graduates of the academies and wish you great success in the important activity you are called upon to conduct in military units.

The Soviet people love their army; they are proud of those who dedicate their lives to building up the armed forces, strengthening the defensive potential of our great homeland!

I congratulate the professors and teachers, the entire staff of the academies who have worked hard to impart to the students the necessary knowledge, to help them master the latest achievements of contemporary military science.

We salute the officers from the socialist countries who have been graduated from military academies this year. We wholeheartedly wish you fruitful work in strengthening the fraternal armies for the good of your peoples, for the sake of the interests of the entire socialist camp.

Comrades, you have finished your studies and will soon be sent to military units. Each of you can and must make his worthy contribution to the great and honorable cause of strengthening the Armed Forces of the Soviet Union. You must always bear in mind that the Soviet people, the Communist Party and the government have entrusted the Soviet soldiers with the defense of the achievements of the October Revolution, the achievements of socialism, attained under the leadership of the party of the great Lenin.

The Armed Forces of the Soviet Union and the fraternal socialist countries stand guard over our splendid present and the still brighter future to which our peoples are advancing under the banner of Marxism-Leninism.

Our entire country is preparing for the Twenty-second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. The special importance of the Twenty-second Congress lies in the fact that it will adopt a new Party program which will lay down the principal tasks in economic and cultural development, in foreign policy and in the communist education of the people. The program will chart the concrete ways of the Soviet people's movement toward communism. Before long all Soviet citizens will be able to acquaint themselves with this highly important document and rejoice at the future of their country, which in the next two decades will achieve magnificent successes in the advance of the economy and culture, in the rise in the living standards of the Soviet people. In its economic development the Soviet Union will outstrip the major capitalist countries.

Efforts for Peaceful Relations between States

Comrades, the Soviet Union is a profoundly peaceloving state. There is no other country in the world which has done so much to safeguard an enduring peace and international cooperation.

The Soviet Union has been exerting tremendous efforts in order to reach agreement on disarmament with strict international control. The idea of general and complete disarmament, advanced by the Soviet Government, has been unanimously approved by the United Nations General Assembly and has met with broad support in all countries of the world.

However, as the talks have shown, the ruling quarters of the Western Powers, while paying lip service to the idea of disarmament, do not really want it. Of late they have even been afraid of mentioning general and complete disarmament. They seek to confine the matter to control over armaments, placing under their control, above all, the up-to-date types of Soviet armaments and military equipment.

The Western Powers are even frustrating the reaching of agreement on the cessation of nuclear weapons tests by refusing us an equal status in the control agency. They would like to

see a system of verification of the cessation of nuclear tests functioning in our country while we would essentially be kept from participating in the work of control agencies. We would have nothing to do but just submit to the decisions of an international administrator, a kind of new Hammarskjold.

Today it is acknowledged in the West that the forces of the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries are not inferior to the forces of the Western Powers.

However, the proper conclusions are not drawn from this fact: given equal forces, there must also be equal rights and equal opportunities. Yet our partners, acknowledging that the balance of power has not tilted in their favor, nevertheless want to dominate in international agencies and impose their will there.

In the solution of the disarmament problem and other international issues the Soviet Government does not seek to place the Western Powers in an unequal situation. But we will never forego our interests.

The Soviet Union has always been ready to examine in a businesslike manner all proposals which are made by governments and statesmen of various countries.

We believe that it would be a good thing to revert to some proposals which various countries have made in recent years, for many of them are highly realistic and their implementation would promote the cause of peace. Let us take, for instance, the Polish proposal for a nuclear-free zone in the center of Europe; the proposals for the withdrawal of foreign troops from foreign territories to within their national boundaries; the conclusion of a nonaggression pact between the NATO countries and the Warsaw Treaty organization; proposals on averting surprise attack and the establishment in Europe of a zone of reciprocal inspection and aerial survey on both sides of the line dividing the armed forces of NATO and the Warsaw Treaty.

Would the acceptance of such proposals hurt anyone? No, it would facilitate a relaxation of international tension, liquidation of the "cold war," and better mutual understanding. However, even if these measures are implemented, general and complete disarmament remains the cardinal problem, the solution of which would radically improve the entire international climate, would make people confident that there will be no third world war.

The Soviet Union will do its utmost to have this problem solved for the good of mankind.

Our country wants to have good relations with all states. One must have a sober approach to the solution of international disputes. We want to eliminate the vestiges of World War II, to put an end to the cold war and thus help to reach agreement on disarmament. It is time to draw a line through the past, it must not stand in the way of the future.

Conclusion of a German Peace Treaty—Western Reactions

Permit me, comrades, to dwell in greater detail on such an important question as the conclusion of a German peace treaty, to let you know what our policy is and what situation is now taking shape.

The Soviet Government together with the governments of the other socialist countries proposed to our allies in the war with fascist Germany the conclusion of a German peace treaty and on this basis the normalization of the situation in West Berlin. We also urged the head of the West German Government, Chancellor Adenauer, to show understanding and good will for a solution of this vital task of our time. The socialist countries have said openly that they want to conclude a peace treaty this year since more than 16 years have elapsed since the end of the war, a more than adequate period to prepare a solution to this problem.

What are the Western reactions to this? The governments have not yet replied officially, but many reports on this score have appeared in Western press organs which are close either to governmental circles or to military staffs or to ruling parties. Unfortunately, voices are being heard expressing much nonsense and little common sense. We are threatened, are told that they will stand "firm," will resort to force in order to break through to West Berlin when the German peace treaty is signed.

Of late threatening notes have also been heard in statements by leaders of Western governments. General de Gaulle, the President of France, recently declared that one French division would be shipped from Algeria to Europe in autumn in order to reinforce NATO.

Mr. Macmillan, the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom,

also has not yet found better, more constructive words than statements on "firmness" for the sake of preserving the vestiges of war and occupation in Germany.

The Soviet Government stands on positions of peace and peaceful coexistence, on positions of respect for sovereignty and nonintervention in the domestic affairs of other states. We have stood and we will stand firmly on this. Our firmness, thus, has a definite, peaceful trend.

When others in one breath mention firmness and the necessity of mobilization, the shipment of more troops to Europe, and the like—that is quite a different course. That is obstinate unwillingness to heed the demand of the times and the voice of reason, an attempt to resort to arms in the old way, believing that this is the weightiest argument in solving ripe international problems.

Replying to our, it would seem, most natural proposals for the conclusion of a peace treaty, the West begins to count divisions. And Chancellor Adenauer is shouting himself hoarse for weapons. What does Adenauer need nuclear weapons for? Twice German militarism has engineered world wars.

Now, when the wounds of World War II are still felt, he calls for nuclear weapons. The Bundeswehr needs them not for peace but for unleashing a third world war.

Many of you, comrades, fought in World War II and saw for yourselves how much suffering it brought; you experienced for yourselves the meaning of war. You all understand what a war would mean now; God forbid that it should break out. Here it is not the number of divisions that will be decisive. In nuclear war the tone will be set by rockets, atom and hydrogen bombs. And it is not so important how many divisions will be shipped from Algeria, one or ten—it makes no difference.

Herr Adenauer did not fight, and evidently wants to make up for it in his old age. He has also indicated against whom to fight. As recently as last Sunday the Bonn Chancellor again qualified the Soviet Union as a "potential enemy" and demanded that the Bundeswehr become equal in armaments with this enemy. At the same time he cursed those who advocate neutrality in West Germany.

Did the Chancellor think as he was speaking? He loves to

pass himself off as a victim of Hitler, yet he follows in Hitler's footsteps. Evidently Adenauer, has no idea what contemporary war means, otherwise he would not play so wrecklessly with the destinies of human beings.

One must call not for war but for peace; one must not worsen the atmosphere, must not carry matters to a conflict. Let us sit down at a table and calmly discuss all questions without resorting to threats. We propose the convocation of a peace conference and we shall go there with our draft treaty. Let the Western Powers make their proposals, submit their draft for a peace settlement. We shall discuss all proposals and accept those which pay due regard to the interests and sovereignty of all states.

Guaranteeing the Free-City Status of West Berlin

West Berlin is an island inside the German Democratic Republic, an island where the capitalist order has been preserved. We do not want to intervene in the domestic affairs of the city's population or affect the prestige of the United States, the United Kingdom or France. Is it possible to find such a solution as would satisfy all countries that fought against Germany and would not disturb the established way of life in West Berlin? Yes, it is possible, and we propose such a solution—to grant West Berlin the status of a free city, to give it a guarantee either by the four Great Powers—the United States, the United Kingdom, France and the Soviet Union—or by neutral countries or the United Nations.

If the Western Powers have a better version of guarantees, let them propose it.

However, it is only natural that any West Berlin solution must take into consideration that the city lies in the center of a sovereign state and that all communications of West Berlin with the outside world pass across the territory of that state. It is accepted in international relations that access to one country or another across the territory of another state has always required appropriate agreement with the authorities of that state.

For instance, the Soviet and British Governments set up a regular air service between Moscow and London. The flight route passes through Copenhagen. But no one would have permitted us to fly via Copenhagen had we not reached an under-

standing with the Danish Government. This is so normal and legitimate that there is nothing puzzling about it. So why should there be another procedure for flights over the territory of the German Democratic Republic or in using her roads and railways?

In proposing to conclude a German peace treaty and on this basis to solve the problem of West Berlin, we threaten no one. We demand neither changes in the postwar social and political conditions in one state or another nor the establishment of new frontiers. The Soviet Union does not search for any gains in the peace settlement, does not seek to humiliate anyone or infringe on anyone's interests.

The socialist countries do not encroach upon the right of the West Berliners to determine freely the social and economic order under which they want to live. No one is going to create obstacles to the access to West Berlin. The city will be able to establish and maintain contacts with any other state to the extent it will be advantageous to it.

The Soviet Government agrees with President Kennedy's recent statement that any West Berlin solution must not infringe upon the right of the population of this city to make an independent choice as free people. Our proposal fully accords with this demand.

The Soviet Government is ready for the most far-reaching guarantees as regards West Berlin. I have more than once mentioned various forms of guarantees, but the NATO countries, which are fanning a psychosis over West Berlin, studiously hush up this part of our proposals.

The capitalist "free" press, sensing the weaknesses of the Western positions, is shouting that the Soviet Union allegedly wants to seize West Berlin, make gains at the expense of others. By such fabrications it seeks to conceal from public opinion the genuine nature of the Soviet proposals. We do not encroach on West Berlin or the freedom of its population. We are for the freedom of West Berlin on a foundation of freedom and not on a foundation of occupation. We want nothing but the liquidation of the vestiges of World War II in order to improve the entire climate in Europe. That is precisely why the Soviet Union insists on the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

The Soviet Union regrets that the leaders of the Western

Powers do not show a desire to cooperate with us in the conclusion of a German peace treaty. Either they do not understand the importance of a peace settlement with Germany for the future of the world or, what is more likely, they cannot rise above the narrow interests of their military blocs.

This is clear and understandable to all who search for reasonable solutions. But there are people who depict our proposals as a "threat" and then say that they will reply with force to this "threat." Is this a sober policy? It is not without reason that it is justly criticized in the Western countries themselves.

The Need for Reason in International Relations

Many people there correctly assess the situation, urge the leaders of the United States, the United Kingdom and France to abandon prejudice and to examine how remote Western policy is from the real conditions in which states live.

One can refer to such prominent authorities in the Western world as United States General MacArthur who in a recent speech at Manila called for outlawing world war. Or to British Field Marshal Montgomery, who suggests the withdrawal of all foreign troops from Europe, the liquidation of foreign military bases, the withdrawal of foreign troops from Berlin, etc. This is the voice of men who have fought in war; they know the meaning of war and have a correct idea of the calamity a new world war would bring mankind should it break out.

We urge the discarding of the method of intimidation. War must not be tolerated—it would take far too many human lives. The first shots might be fired on the border where troops are facing each other. But who can guarantee that these shots will not be echoed by nuclear explosions throughout the world, that a war will not begin which mixes up front and rear? Everyone must be aware of this. Those who threaten us ought to know that we are able to rebuff aggressors. We have the means for this.

The Soviet Union has made tremendous progress in economy, culture and technology. Our people created and built up armed forces that bore the brunt of the struggle against fascism and crushed German militarism.

This gives us the right—I think I shall be understood correctly—to appeal to the leaders of the countries that were allies in the

last war: to the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy; the President of the French Republic, General de Gaulle; the Prime Minister of the United Kingdom, Mr. Macmillan, urging them to display wisdom in the solution of the German problem, to attend a conference together with other peace-loving states, and to conclude a peace treaty.

Common sense—and once again, common sense—is needed, above all, now. And it must find an expression in peaceful deeds, in the desire to eradicate tension. No other step in our time can be more peaceable than the conclusion of a peace treaty and the liquidation of the vestiges of the last war.

We propose peace; we want reason to prevail in the relations between states, peaceful coexistence and competition to show which system provides greater material and spiritual blessings to the peoples. The peoples must determine themselves which system accords with their vital interests, the communist system or the capitalist.

Proposing the conclusion of a peace treaty, the Soviet Government does not want some to gain and others to lose. Let us record what exists. No one's sovereignty will be affected by the conclusion of a German peace treaty. The militaristic revenge-seeking quarters in West Germany, of course, will dislike the peace treaty.

It will tie their hands, make it more difficult to collect forces for fresh gambles. But therein, of course, lies the meaning of a peace treaty—to cut short the dangerous play of the West German revanchists, who seek to take advantage of instability in Europe and to set the Great Powers at loggerheads.

I repeat, there are no serious reasons which should really prevent a peace settlement with Germany, but nevertheless the opponents of international relaxation and the conclusion of a peace treaty seek to justify such a position by all kinds of insolvent arguments.

They declare, for instance, that the division of Germany prevents a peace settlement. If the Western Powers really wanted to help the Germans to unite, far from obstructing, they would advise the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to enter into negotiations with the Government of the German Democratic Republic. They would support the proposal of the

Government of the German Democratic Republic for setting up a confederation of the two German states.

If the absence of an all-German government really prevented the conclusion of a peace treaty, the Western Powers and the Federal Republic of Germany would accept the proposal the Soviet Union is now making; to wit, that the Germans should meet before the signing of a German peace treaty to hammer out common views both on the question of a peace settlement and on the reunification of the country.

It is the business of the Germans themselves to restore Germany's national unity. No states have the right to interfere in this affair, because no one can solve this question but the Germans themselves. We do not intend to conduct any talks on this question. Let the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic reach agreement on this question, and we shall recognize any decision they reach.

But if anyone calculates on using our hands to liquidate the socialist system in the German Democratic Republic, he is living in a world of illusion. The German Democratic Republic has a loyal and reliable friend in the Soviet Union.

*Normalization of the Situation in Germany and
West Berlin a Necessity*

There are many unsettled matters in Germany. This, apparently, is now acknowledged by everyone, and hence the logical conclusion—we must resolve these matters and not wait till they cause a conflict. Questions of an international nature must be resolved at a corresponding forum. Inter-German problems can be settled only by the Germans themselves.

The Soviet Government will regret very much if any one of our former allies does not sign together with us a German peace treaty and if West Germany refuses to accept the hand of reconciliation extended to her by the socialist states. We cannot put up with the solution of this question, vitally important for so many states and peoples, being dragged out for many more years only because definite quarters wish to save for themselves opportunities for revenge and perpetuate an occupation regime on a part of German territory. The Soviet Union will be confronted

with the need of reaching agreement with the German Democratic Republic and the countries that wish to conclude a peace treaty with this peaceloving German state.

The procedure of the conclusion of a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic will conform strictly to obtaining international practice and customs. After the conclusion of the treaty, the Soviet Union will surrender all obligations it had hitherto discharged on the communication lanes with West Berlin. In short, the Government of the German Democratic Republic will enjoy full sovereignty over all its territory just as any other independent state.

You, comrades, are military people and you know very well what it is to disregard the provisions of a peace treaty and to try to violate the sovereignty of the German Democratic Republic. Many of you will serve in the forces which, under the Warsaw Treaty, are stationed in the territory of the German Democratic Republic, and this means that you will have to rebuff the aggressive forces if they decide to frustrate peaceful settlement by force of arms. I call your attention to the fact that it is precisely a peace treaty to which some people threaten to reply with force and over which they threaten to cause a dangerous international crisis.

The Soviet Government is displaying persistence in the conclusion of a German peace treaty, convinced that if measures are not taken now to normalize the situation in Germany and West Berlin, the people may be confronted with the fact of an aggression launched by the West German militarists. There is no guarantee that some venture of the West German successors of Hitler will not light the fire of a big war. Then it will be too late to investigate what prevented the timely conclusion of a peace treaty and why, despite all the warnings of the peaceloving forces, militarism in West Germany was allowed to rise to its feet and take up arms again.

Remember how Hitler pushed the world to the brink of war and then unleashed it. He advanced gradually, step by step, methodically to this goal, extorting concessions from the Western Powers. He was encouraged by the ruling quarters of Britain, France and America. They believed that with the help of fascism they would be able to defeat the Soviet Union, to destroy communism.

There is a no small number of documents and books describing how Hitler Germany prepared World War II. For instance, recently I read the book by the French journalist Genevieve Tabouis, *Twenty Years of Diplomatic Struggle*. This book shows very well the backstage aspect of the collusion of German militarists with the reactionary forces of the other countries of monopoly capital.

Apparently the frantic monopolists and West German revanchists would not mind embarking again on this road with a view to settling disputed questions through war. The monopolists regard the question of communism, its development, as the principal issue. Their reason is obscured by hatred for communism, for the countries of socialism. Their centers of restraint may fail them and the imperialists may unleash a new war. Adenauer is repeating what Hitler had done in his time when preparing for war. And actually the same countries that encouraged Hitler are now encouraging him.

But they forget that the situation has changed radically since then. In those days the Soviet Union and People's Mongolia were in a capitalist encirclement. Now the mighty socialist camp is growing and gaining in strength, a camp which unites over one billion people. The colonial system is collapsing, and ever new independent states are emerging and embarking upon the road of a peaceful policy. Today it is not the forces of imperialism but the forces of peace and socialism that determine the main laws, the main direction of international and social development.

The Soviet Union is displaying maximum good will to achieve understanding with our former allies and the Federal Republic of Germany. But the language of threats and intimidation to which the West often resorts does not promote a businesslike atmosphere for negotiation. Moreover, under such circumstances, the conclusion of a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic, with all the attendant consequences, may prove to be the only way out of the obtaining situation.

We shall sign the peace treaty and order our armed forces to administer a worthy rebuff to any aggressor if he dares raise a hand against the Soviet Union or our friends.

Modern Arms and the Danger of War

The Soviet Government sincerely strives to achieve a lasting peace. But we must not forget that the safeguarding of peace depends not only on our desire, not only on our efforts. A lasting peace can be ensured only if efforts to achieve this goal are also exerted by the governments of other states, if the peoples of all the world fight for this.

We say that a new world is not inevitable. However, it must not be considered that the possibility of war has already been ruled out completely inasmuch as the imperialist powers still exist. That is why we must be ready for any contingencies and be well prepared. The Soviet people, and our youth above all, must be vigilant and ready to defend the country, to rebuff the aggressor if he dares attack our homeland.

We must perfect our weapons, improve our skill in handling arms so that they fire without fail and with pin-point precision. This must be remembered primarily by you, the commanders and leaders of our forces. The Soviet Army must be ready at any moment to defend reliably the peaceful construction of communism in the Soviet Union and to fulfill its international duty of rendering aid to the other socialist nations.

The Soviet Armed Forces today have everything necessary to fulfill successfully the responsible tasks set before them. They possess the necessary quantities of thermonuclear weapons and the most efficient means of delivering them—close-combat, intermediate and intercontinental missiles.

It is best for those who think of war not to imagine that distance will save them. If the imperialists unleash a war, it will end with imperialism's complete debacle and ruin. Mankind will end once and for all the system which gives rise to aggressive war.

Comrades, the Government of the Soviet Union follows attentively the military measures taken of late by the United States of America and its NATO allies. We cannot disregard such facts as the building up of armed forces in the Western countries or the steps to increase considerably the number of strategic A-bombers which are constantly kept in the air. The forces of West Germany are being equipped with the latest weapons and increased numerically.

The United States President, Mr. Kennedy, proclaimed in his recent messages to Congress the so-called "new course." It provides for stepping up the program of developing rocket-missile strategic weapons and the raising of the military readiness of all the services. For this purpose President Kennedy has proposed that military allocations, as compared with the draft budget submitted by the previous President, be increased by more than 3.5 billion dollars. This means that the military expenditures in the fiscal year 1961-1962 will exceed 53 billion dollars. The military expenditures in the Federal Republic of Germany increased 18 per cent this year. A considerable rise in military expenditures is characteristic of Britain, France and other NATO countries.

This is how the Western Powers are replying to the Soviet Union's unilateral reduction of its armed forces and military expenditures during the past several years.

Would it be correct for us in these conditions to continue reducing our armed forces unilaterally?

Taking into account the obtaining situation, the Soviet Government was compelled to instruct the Defense Ministry to suspend temporarily, pending special orders, the reduction of the armed forces planned for 1961.

In view of the growing military budgets in the NATO countries, the Soviet Government has passed a decision to increase defense spending in the current year by 3.144 billion rubles, thereby raising the total military expenditures in 1961 to 12.399 billion rubles.

These are forced measures, comrades. We are taking them, due to the emerging circumstances, because we cannot neglect the interests of the Soviet people's security.

Improvement of Soviet-American Relations

Comrades, we are firmly convinced that the solution of many pressing problems pertaining to the improvement of the international situation depends greatly on the improvement of relations between the Soviet Union and the United State of America. Of course we realize that the improvement of Soviet-American relations is not a simple task. It cannot be achieved without the desire and practical steps of both sides.

Interesting in this light is the statement made by the President of the United States, Mr. Kennedy, at his June 28 press conference, where he dwelt on peaceful economic competition between our two countries. We appreciate such an approach. This, of course, is much better than competing in the development of ever more destructive types of weapons. We have always said this and we go on repeating it.

The Soviet Union still lags behind the United States as regards the level of its economic development, and we frankly admit it. But our country has inexhaustible potentialities to overcome this lag quickly and to become richer than the United States.

The Soviet people are convinced that the time is not far off when the Soviet Union will overtake and outstrip the United States of America as regards basic economic indices. This is not wishful thinking but concrete plans based on concrete calculations.

Our desire to be richer than the United States, to overtake it in economic development, does not mean, of course, a threat to the United States. Some people call this our challenge to the United States. But this is a challenge to peaceful competition. What's bad in that? Irrespective of who wins this competition, the peoples of both countries will benefit from it because they will enjoy the boons of peaceful labor.

President Kennedy acknowledged in his statement at the press conference that the socialist system permits the Soviet Union to overtake the United States. He believes, it is true, that this will happen in a more distant future than indicated by us. He questions the feasibility of our plans, but facts, life itself, eloquently show that he is not right.

I shall not polemicize against Mr. Kennedy. Simple calculations will suffice. The volume of the Soviet Union's industrial production accounted for 60 per cent of the American output in 1960. The average annual rates of industrial growth in our country equalled 10.6 per cent during the past 16 years. If the Soviet industrial output continues to grow annually by 10 per cent, in 1966 the Soviet Union will produce 106 per cent of the present-day American output; and in 1970, 156 per cent.

To grow 56 per cent in 10 years, United States industrial

output must increase 4.5 per cent annually. But even if the Americans succeed in ensuring an annual increment of 4.5 per cent, as Mr. Kennedy would like it, we shall overtake them just the same in 1970.

If the Americans retain the rate of their industrial output at 2 per cent, which they averaged in the postwar years, the Soviet Union will outstrip America in 1967. If American industrial output increases 3 per cent annually, we shall leave them behind in 1968.

Approximately the same figures could be adduced with regard to the prospects for agricultural development in our two countries.

Forecasts on economic development arouse most of the arguments, of course. I for instance, am skeptical about the statements Mr. Kennedy made during the election campaign, criticizing Eisenhower for the low rates of American economic development. He promised an economic upswing with the advent of the new administration in the United States, and lower unemployment.

Back in those days, speaking to Mrs. Roosevelt, I said that if the Democratic Party came to power and Mr. Kennedy became President, he would hardly be able, in my opinion, to achieve more in the economic sphere than Eisenhower's government. As a matter of fact, this is exactly what happened. Look, for instance, at unemployment. Last October the United States had 3.5 million jobless. This June, eight months later, the number of unemployed did not decline, but increased to 5.5 million.

Under the capitalist system economic development depends very little on the President. Every capitalist disposes of his capital himself and throws the workers out into the street if this benefits him.

Such are the laws of capitalism, Draconic laws that still operate. The socialist system, of course, does not and cannot have any of this.

We can argue about the prospects of economic development in this or that state. We can make various guesses, but these arguments are no reason for war among states.

So, let's allow history, Mr. Kennedy, to determine who is making correct forecasts and who is erring.

An important role in the development of good relations among nations is played by economic, cultural and other contacts, and the Soviet Union is striving to develop them. We have favorable trade relations with Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, and West Germany. This trade benefits both sides.

Our trade relations with other countries are developing, too. But this cannot be said about trade with the United States. Actually, we do not have any trade with the United States, and this is not to the advantage of the two countries. I should like to be understood correctly. We come out for the development of trade with the United States of America not because we cannot do without it. The Soviet Union will not only keep going but will continue its rapid advance, fulfilling and overfulfilling the drafted economic plans.

But is it possible to speak earnestly about the improvement of relations and the creation of an atmosphere of confidence between the two mightiest powers in the world if one of them pursues a policy of economic discrimination with regard to the other? Of course not. If the United States had displayed good common sense and given up the policy of artificially restricting trade relations with the Soviet Union, this would have promoted the improvement of friendly relations, the improvement of the international climate.

The Soviet policy is a policy of peaceful coexistence, a policy of economic competition. That is why we tell President Kennedy, General de Gaulle, Mr. Macmillan—let's compete in this sphere. This would be sensible. If we were to conclude a peace treaty with Germany, shake hands and declare that we shall devote our efforts to economic competition, all the people of the world would heave a sigh of relief. This would be a good prologue for further talks and the implementation of mankind's age-old dream for lasting peace on earth. We are ready for this and we offer our hand to the Western governments.

Comrades, the Soviet Army has scored many glorious victories over the enemies of our homeland. Today it is the most up-to-date, the mightiest army in the world. The technical basis of our Soviet Army, Navy and Air Force has been changed radically

during the past few years, thanks to the concern displayed by the Party and the people. Our Armed Forces will go on developing and improving continuously, will go on being equipped with the mightiest weapons, until a general disarmament plan is adopted.

However, no matter how up-to-date and strong military techniques are, they can accomplish their end only if placed in the reliable and skillful hands of servicemen who are ideologically steeled, courageous and boundlessly loyal to their homeland.

Responsibility for the fulfillment of the tasks confronting the Soviet Armed Forces rests, above all, on the officer cadres. To be up to the mark, the officers must persistently master Marxist-Leninist theory.

A Soviet officer must always and everywhere be a model of political maturity and high morality, and must discharge his military duty impeccably. At the same time high and constant exactingness is needed in the Armed Forces more than anywhere else, along with the iron will of the commanders, unbending abidance by the principle of undivided command. To command means to be an organizer of the masses, to guide the people skillfully toward the set goals.

Officers must sensibly use their great rights to raise battle preparedness, to strengthen discipline and order in units and on ships.

Military discipline is called the mother of victory. And it must be said that the experience of war fully confirms this truth. New equipment and new types of weapons, far from reducing, immeasurably raise the importance of military discipline.

In our time an officer must have high military-technical training, must possess a wide range of theoretical views. He can successfully discharge his duty if he keeps abreast of the development of military theory and practice.

Suffice it to give oneself airs for a short time to be among those lagging behind. A critical attitude toward the results of one's work, irreconcilability toward shortcomings, honesty and truthfulness to the Party and the people must be inherent qualities in all our officers.

The Soviet Army has always been strong thanks to the consciousness of its personnel, allegiance to the sacred ideals of our Party. The soldiers' high level of ideological belief, their readi-

ness to fight honestly for the Soviet homeland, for our people, for the lofty ideals of socialism constitute the great advantage of our Army over the armies of the capitalist states.

It is imperative to continue persistently rearing our soldiers on the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, in a spirit of Soviet patriotism, friendship between peoples and proletarian internationalism.

The strength of our Army, created under the guidance of the great Lenin, lies in its unbreakable bonds with the people. It owes all its successes and victories to the Party. Guidance by the Party, its constant solicitude in strengthening the Armed Forces, is the foundation of foundations of military affairs, the basis of strengthening the defensive potential of the Soviet Union.

Enhancing the role and influence of Party organizations in the Army and the Navy must continue to be the foundation of our military policy. It is the task of commanders, political workers and all chiefs in their activity to draw skillfully on Party organizations, steadily to channel the creative energy and activity of Communists and Young Communist League members into raising the battle preparedness of the Soviet Armed Forces.

Difficult and honorable is the activity of our officers. They bear full responsibility for their subordinates, for their education and training. The necessity of the troops' constant battle preparedness demands intense work from commanders and political workers, and from the entire personnel.

The people have entrusted their armed forces with vigilantly standing guard over our great Soviet homeland, confidently advancing toward communism. Show yourself worthy of this great trust.

Dear comrades, may I once again heartily congratulate you on graduating from the military academies and wish you great success in your lofty work in the name of peace and the security of our socialist homeland.

Long live the powerful and prosperous Soviet homeland!

Long live the gallant Soviet Armed Forces and their officer cadres!

Glory to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, the organizer and inspirer of all our victories!

**THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S REPLY TO THE U.S.
GOVERNMENT NOTE OF JULY 17 ON A PEACE TREATY
WITH GERMANY AND THE SITUATION IN
WEST BERLIN, AUGUST 3, 1961**

In connection with the note of the United States Government of July 17, 1961, which was a reply to the Soviet Government's memorandum handed to President Kennedy in Vienna on June 4, 1961, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics finds it necessary to state the following:

The Soviet Government was willing to believe that the United States Government is sincerely prepared to assist in consolidating peace, eliminating the sources of tension in the relations between states, in peacefully settling urgent international problems, as was solemnly declared by the present administration of the United States. However, in reply to the Soviet Union's call to begin settling jointly one of the most important and burning issues of our time on whose solution peace and tranquility in Europe depends—the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany—the United States Government confined itself to setting forth the US former position, which is far removed from true concern for peace, including peace in Europe.

For many years the United States has been evading a peaceful settlement with Germany, putting it off indefinitely. The American note shows that the United States Government, apparently, prefers to continue adhering to this line.

The attempt is amazing to present the United States almost as the champion of a peaceful settlement with Germany and the Soviet Union as the side raising obstacles in this matter. To lend a semblance of truthfulness to this attempt, the Government of the United States in its note makes an excursion into history. It is highly significant, however, that it succeeded in finding in diplomatic archives only one fact—a time when the United States

came out with a proposal to prepare a peace treaty with Germany, the fact dating back to 1946.

Directly after the end of the war, when the USSR and the United States acted as allies, there were no differences between them in general regarding the necessity for eradicating German militarism, ensuring the democratization of Germany and concluding a peace treaty, as envisaged by the Potsdam Agreements. It was precisely because of this that it proved possible then actually to agree on the procedure of concluding a peace treaty. Soon, however, the United States Government, together with the governments of other Western Powers, made a sharp turn in its policy in Germany. It took the line toward placing German militarists back in the saddle. It is clear that after such a turn in United States policy, there was no room left for a peace treaty with Germany. The talks about the procedure of concluding a peace treaty, which were nearing completion, proved unnecessary for the United States, Britain and France, and they led them into a blind alley.

Throughout all the years since, the Western Powers have been declining the Soviet Union's proposals on preparing a peace treaty. Such was the case in 1949 when the Soviet Government suggested that a draft peace treaty with Germany be prepared within three months and discussion started on it. The United States Government refused to discuss the question of a peace treaty with Germany in 1952 also, when the Soviet Government submitted its draft of the foundations of such a treaty for the Western Powers' consideration. No positive response came from the United States to the Soviet Union's proposal to discuss the question of a peace treaty in 1954. The United States continued to adhere to its negative position in subsequent years, too. Suffice it to say that the United States rose up in arms against the new initiative of the Soviet Union which in January 1959 offered a draft peace treaty with Germany.

It should be added that throughout these 15 years the United States Government for its part has not even once suggested that a peace treaty with Germany be started, and even avoided stating what provisions, in its opinion, should be reflected in the peace treaty.

These facts alone are sufficient to show how little an appeal to

history can help the United States Government.

Why then was it necessary for the United States Government to embark on the road of misrepresenting generally known facts and commit obvious distortions? The entire contents of the American note show that the United States Government's main concern is to justify its policy in the eyes of world public opinion and, as far as possible, avoid responsibility for the fact that no line has thus far been drawn through World War II and that there is no stable international lawful order in the center of Europe, while militarists and revanchists are again growing in West Germany.

With this end in view all the trite and absolutely unconvincing arguments against the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany which travel from one American note to another are gathered in this American note. These arguments could have been overlooked if the point in question were not so important a matter for the destiny of peace in Europe as a peaceful settlement with Germany. In such a matter there should be no place for misunderstandings, vagueness or erroneous conclusions.

The United States Government is doing the peoples harm when it tries, in its note, to present the matter as though the absence of a peace treaty with Germany does not create a real danger. How far in a falsehood one can go in this connection is shown by the assertion contained in the note that it is not the absence of a peace treaty that constitutes a threat to peace but the Soviet Union's proposal on the necessity of concluding such a treaty, and that the German problem has in no way troubled the world for a whole decade.

Maybe the United States Government is indeed not troubled by the situation that took shape in the center of Europe, but it has no right to ascribe its viewpoint to the whole world.

Before everybody's eyes West Germany is becoming a seat of war danger in Europe. A regular army headed by former Hitler generals and officers has sprung up there. Even now West Germany has the largest army on the European continent among all the NATO member-countries. Representatives of the FRG (Federal Republic of Germany) are capturing key posts in NATO headquarters, one after another. The West German military are eager to get weapons of mass destruction into their possession.

The Bundeswehr is being formed and trained as an army designed to wage rocket-nuclear war. As was the case in Hitler Germany, close contacts have been established between the army and industrial monopolies which are prepared to satisfy all its needs. The work of scientific-technical thought conducted in the quiet of studies and laboratories has been placed at the service of the Bundeswehr. But it is general knowledge that in our time some laboratories are much more dangerous than military barracks.

Now, in peacetime, the Bundeswehr has at its disposal a network of military strongholds on the territories of a number of states in Western Europe, including Britain and France—the United States' NATO allies.

If we multiply the military-material basis of the FRG by the militarist and revanchist spirit which, like a quarter of a century ago, permeates all spheres of the state and public life in West Germany, the gravity of the danger created by the present developments in the FRG will become self-evident.

Facts show that in the course of the 16 years that have elapsed since the surrender, the German militarists and revanchists, with the assistance of the United States, Britain and France, have achieved in West Germany much more than their predecessors had achieved in the 16 years after the First World War.

It is said that now in West Germany there is no *fuehrer* named Hitler. But do names determine the course of events? The course of events is influenced by people. And in West Germany there are would-be *fuehrers* galore.

The population of West Germany lives in an atmosphere of rampant revanchist passions. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany now and again advances demands for revision of the existing frontiers.

Actually the FRG Government acts in Europe as the most zealous initiator of the policy "from positions of strength" and herald of the "cold war." It is even now prepared to bring matters to the extreme but in such a way as to enable West Germany to remain on the side lines for the time being. The FRG Government would like best of all for the United States to defend the interests of Bonn revanchists until the last American soldier dies.

It is easy to imagine what language the West German militarists would be using were they to get nuclear weapons in their hands, with which the Western Powers seem to be willing to assist them. How can the Soviet Government, remembering the devastating invasion of the Hitler hordes, ignore the fact that preparations for *Drang nach Osten* are being again made in West Germany at a fast pace?

It is highly indicative that even the United States Government in its note could not bypass Bonn's revanchist demands. True enough, these demands are presented in the note almost as evidence of the devotion of the FRG Government to peace, since it declares that it has no intention to use force for revising Germany's frontiers. But who can trust such promises? Everybody knows how little significance the Bonn government itself attaches to such assurances.

It is impossible not to recall, for instance, that in November 1949 Chancellor Adenauer declared in public that he is "in principle against the rearmament of the FRG and thus also against the creation of new German armed forces." This in no way prevented the FRG Government from carrying out a large-scale remilitarization of the country and creating the Bundeswehr. When the question of atomic weapons was raised, Chancellor Adenauer resorted to the same maneuver. He began by professing to be a man who does not want atomic death for the German people. In 1957 Chancellor Adenauer declared that he cannot welcome the arming of new powers with nuclear weapons and that the FRG did not request nuclear weapons. Now the same Adenauer bluntly expresses the demand to place the FRG on an equal footing with the nuclear powers as regards armaments.

After all this it would be naive, to say the least, to attach any significance to the statements of the FRG Government to the effect that it has no intention of using force for achieving its political aims. Indeed, the FRG Government apparently is not in the least embarrassed when it goes back on its own assurances.

Of course, it is important what attitude this or that statesman of the FRG takes toward his own words. It is immeasurably more important, however, that no unilateral assurances replace the firm and clear provisions of a peace treaty which are binding on all its signatories.

In its effort to legalize the present abnormal situation and to depreciate the idea of a peace treaty with Germany, the United States Government actually casts doubt on the role of law in the life of peoples and in the development of relations between states, with which view, of course, we cannot agree. The conclusion of a peace treaty is a natural and generally accepted transition from the state of war to peace. Without such a settlement the remnants of war will inevitably mar the relations between the former belligerents and serve as a source of friction and mutual distrust between them. But if a peace treaty is necessary in any case for drawing a line through the past war, its significance grows a hundredfold when one of the successors of the vanquished state refuses to recognize the real position that took shape as a result of the war and is again hatching evil plans against its neighbors, against general peace. Under such circumstances the refusal to conclude a peace treaty would be tantamount to an invitation for revenge and a promise of impunity.

In its note the United States Government makes an attempt to present the participation of the FRG in the NATO military bloc as another confirmation of the fact that West Germany, allegedly, threatens nobody even without a peace treaty. If the United States Government is to be believed, then it follows that the NATO aggressive bloc is a peaceloving organization, the FRG's participation in that bloc is a guarantee of the security of European states, and military decisions taken within the framework of NATO are a sufficient substitute for the provisions of a peace treaty with Germany.

But whom are such assertions meant for? If they are meant for the Soviet people, they are wide of the mark from beginning to end.

However, even if we put aside the question of the orientation of the NATO bloc itself, even then one must be blind not to see that the FRG's participation in that bloc creates truly hothouse conditions for German militarism. It is precisely along the NATO channels that the most up-to-date types of armaments for the Bundeswehr flow to West Germany. Participation in NATO has enabled the FRG to site its military bases on vast expanses of West Europe, something which even Hitler Germany did not have when it was preparing to trigger off World War II. Of no

little importance also is the fact that in NATO organs West German military specialists have access to military secrets of other member-states of this bloc.

The United States Government, apparently, is inclined to belittle the significance of the war potential of the FRG, proceeding from the fact that so far it is much inferior to the American. But it would be dangerous to overlook the fact that the FRG now has more than sufficient armed forces and armaments to provoke a general military conflict. Indeed, in order to blow up a powder magazine it is not necessary to be its commander. For this purpose it is sufficient to have a lunatic among the officers—close associates of the commander—who would strike the match.

No matter whether we proceed from the necessity of raising an obstacle to the growth of militarism and revanchism in West Germany, a growth dangerous to the cause of peace, or from the interests of improving relations between the Great Powers; no matter whether we are guided by the interests of the German people themselves or the peoples who shed their blood in the war against Hitler Germany—the conclusion is unavoidable, that a German peace treaty must be concluded.

This is demanded by the aims solemnly proclaimed at one time, the aims which in the war years gave inspiration to the participants in the anti-Hitler coalition, in which a leading role was played by the Soviet Union, the United States of America, Great Britain and France. In those years the common aims of the Allies enabled them to solve the most difficult military and political tasks jointly.

Urging that an end be put to the situation in which, despite the 16 years that have passed since the end of the war, no German peace treaty has yet been concluded, the Soviet Government is seeking to eliminate differences on the German issue, to restore relations of cooperation with the United States of America for the benefit of peace. The Soviet Government is convinced that if all states concerned show good will and desire to cooperate, there will be no insurmountable obstacles to the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

In its note the United States Government emphasizes that the question of a peace settlement with Germany cannot be settled until the reunification of Germany has been realized. But this is,

to say the least, an unrealistic approach to the question. The problem of Germany's unification is a purely internal problem of the German people, and it can be solved only on the basis of agreement between the two German states—the GDR (German Democratic Republic) and the FRG—whereas the question of a peace treaty is international in its very nature and affects the interests of many states.

Speaking of Germany's unification, the United States Government deemed it appropriate to touch on the question of the right to self-determination. Thus it appears that the right of self-determination is defended by those who in real life serve as a bulwark of colonial order and every time block the way to this or that people when it begins the struggle for the right to independent national development.

Manipulating the slogan of self-determination of the German nation in the conditions in which two independent German states exist is a rather cheap trick. It is not on the national question that the GDR and the FRG now differ. They are separated by deep-seated differences in their internal way of life, in other words—by deep-seated differences. To try to counterpose the slogan of self-determination to the struggle inside a nation for social progress means juggling with concepts. If we are to speak of the social system—and this is precisely the matter to be discussed in connection with the formation of two independent states instead of former Germany—both these states have long since made their choice.

It is a matter for the Germans themselves to search for a way to unite their two states which are developing in different directions. In a situation where the FRG Government flatly refuses even to start talks with the GDR Government on the question of unification, there, of course, can be and will be no prospect of the two German states reaching agreement on this question, in view of such a policy of the FRG Government. This is an irrefutable fact and it cannot be ignored.

The Four Powers can change nothing in the obtaining situation. Even if they agreed among themselves on the method of Germany's reunification desirable to them, they would have to impose their decision on the two German states by force. What would this have in common with the principle of self-determina-

tion, about the application of which the United States Government speaks for the solution of the problem of Germany's reunification?

If the Four Powers can at all help practically in solving the problem of Germany's reunification, it is only by concluding a peace treaty. By assuming identical international commitments under the peace treaty, both German states would thus have a common ground for rapprochement in the interests of solving the general national tasks of the German people. But to make the conclusion of a German peace treaty dependent on the solution of the problem of Germany's reunification means to refuse to settle either of the questions.

The Soviet Government maintains that under the conditions now obtaining the conclusion of a peace treaty with the participation of all states who were in the state of war with Germany on the one hand and both German states on the other hand would be the best solution. As pointed out by the Soviet Government, it regards as also possible a solution to the question of a German peace treaty in which two peace treaties would be concluded—one with the German Democratic Republic, and the other with the Federal Republic of Germany—with the basic provisions of both treaties being identical.

At the same time the situation in Europe is becoming so tense that it is impossible and dangerous to align oneself with the position of those who, for these or other narrow considerations, continue to object to the conclusion of a peace treaty. To follow in the wake of the opponents of a peace settlement with Germany would mean to share with them grave responsibility for all the consequences of further delays in concluding a peace treaty. The Soviet Union would betray the basic principles of its policy of peace were it to follow this road and permit the events, clearly leading to the growth of the danger of war, to develop in this way.

If the Western Powers and the FRG Government, as they constantly declare, refuse to sign a peace treaty with Germany, such a treaty will have to be signed without them. In this case a peace treaty will be concluded between the states which participated in the war against Hitler Germany, and which desire to do so, and the German Democratic Republic, which has already agreed to this.

It is superfluous to say much about the great positive significance that the conclusion of a peace treaty with the GDR will have. This treaty will juridically seal the frontiers of Germany established after World War II. The fact that in one part of Germany—the German Democratic Republic—an end has been put once and for all to the sinister past, when German militarism used to unleash aggressive wars, will get international recognition. A peace treaty with the GDR, like a beacon, will indicate to all German people a way to peaceful life in the conditions of full sovereignty and independence, a way to the solution of their general national tasks. All this will be conducive to the establishment of stability in the center of Europe and the consolidation of world peace.

It goes without saying that the contention of the American note that a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic “would have no validity from the viewpoint of international law” will be unable to influence the position of the Soviet Union and of other peaceloving states which have adopted a firm decision to put an end to the impermissible procrastinations in concluding a peace treaty with Germany. To substantiate its obviously untenable viewpoint, the United States Government failed to adduce any arguments except attacks impermissible in relations between states, against the political and social system of the German Democratic Republic—a state of German workers and peasants.

The Soviet Government does not find it possible to enter into polemics with the United States Government on the questions of the internal system of the GDR. The socio-economic and political system of any state concerns the people itself and nobody else. The states which participated in the anti-Hitler coalition have grounds to be interested in the questions of the internal life of both German states only from the viewpoint of the fulfillment of the commitments to eradicate nazism and militarism as an indispensable prerequisite for the peaceable and democratic development of Germany. But no one can deny that it is precisely in the German Democratic Republic that the Potsdam decisions have been fully carried into life, which can in no way be said about West Germany.

Besides, it by no means befits those in whose countries the

social status, rights and dignity of a man depend on the color of his skin and on his bank account to teach democracy to the socialist states. In general, what is the worth of deliberations contained in the United States note about the election system in the GDR, if the United States finds it appropriate for itself to maintain the closest contacts — even up to a military alliance — with such states as, for instance, Spain, where a fascist dictatorship reigns, hated by the people, a dictatorship which came to power over heaps of Spanish bodies.

The American Government is trying to interpret the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany as a “unilateral act,” as deviation of the USSR from the Allied agreements on Germany. But who, if not the United States together with its partners in military blocs, has built its entire policy in Germany on unilateral, separate actions and deprived the Soviet Union of its legitimate right to participate in settling the questions affecting a greater part of Germany’s present territory?

One must have a very poor memory to forget the whole chain of unilateral actions by the Western Powers which led to the split of Germany. Here we have the formation of “Bizonia,”* the destruction of the Allied control mechanism, the separate currency reform, and the establishment of the Bonn state itself.

Thus the point seems to be that the three Western Powers had the right to annul in 1952-1953, in their application to West Germany, the laws and decisions of the Control Council worked out by the Four Powers and to declare these actions compatible with Allied duty.

The point also seems to be that the Western Powers could sign the Paris agreements with West Germany in 1954 which legalized the militarization of that country; but the Soviet Union, which gained victory over Germany at a price of many millions of lives, must be denied the right to a peace treaty.

Besides, it is known that the United States took to the road of unilateral decisions not only on the German question. What about the conclusion of a peace treaty with Japan without the Soviet Union’s participation? And after all this, the United States Government takes it upon itself to speak about “unilateral actions” of the Soviet Union.

*The term applies to the merger of the US and British occupation zones in Germany—Ed.

It follows from the American note that the United States Government is mainly displeased by the fact that the conclusion of a peace treaty with the GDR would do away with the legal basis for further preserving the occupation regime and the presence of the troops of the Western Powers in West Berlin. But in reality there is no isolated problem of West Berlin that is not connected with the German peace treaty. By refusing to take part in a peace settlement, the United States Government would place itself in a position where the West Berlin question would be settled without it, with all the consequences for the rights of the Western Powers based on Germany's surrender.

The proposal to turn West Berlin into a demilitarized free city means only that the Soviet Union is ready to settle, jointly with all sides concerned, the question of the status of West Berlin after the signing of a German peace treaty.

The United States Government repeatedly referred to certain commitments it has with regard to West Berlin. True, the question of West Berlin appears in the Paris agreements signed by the Western Powers with the FRG Government. But on what grounds can one equate the separate Paris agreements and the Allied agreements of the Four Powers? Many may be the commitments assumed by the United States of America in different areas of the world when pursuing a policy of knocking together military blocs.

"The commitments" with regard to West Berlin to which the United States Government refers were born not of the joint struggle of the peoples of the Soviet Union, the United States and other states against Hitler Germany. They are the consequence of another war imposed on the peoples—the cold war.

Thus it appears that the United States would like to base the right to the presence of its troops in West Berlin on the agreements signed together with the Soviet Union, but the "commitments" with regard to that city — on the agreements concluded without the Soviet Union and against it. The Soviet Government cannot and will never recognize as legitimate such a contradictory position.

Today West Berlin is an occupied city, as it was 16 years ago. This, the right of military occupation, is the only basis for the presence of the Western Powers in West Berlin. And when the

United States speaks of "protecting the freedom of the city," it is concerned only for preserving in West Berlin the occupation regime which, as admitted by the United States Government itself, only causes general irritation.

As regards the freedom of West Berlin — that is, the inalienable right of the city's population to settle the questions of internal life at their own discretion and to establish the political and social system in accordance with their own desire — this freedom is threatened by no one. On the contrary, the conclusion of a peace treaty, be it with one or both German states, will create a more solid basis for ensuring the freedom of West Berlin, since its population will live not in conditions of an occupation regime but in the conditions of international lawful order.

The United States Government refuses to take part in solving the problem of a German peace treaty on an agreed basis, but at the same time objects to the conclusion of a peace treaty between a number of states which were members of the anti-Hitler coalition and the German Democratic Republic. What is it that the United States Government aims to achieve in this way? Indeed, it cannot prevent the conclusion of a peace treaty with the GDR. Such a treaty will be concluded if the United States and the other Western Powers stop obstructing the solution of the question of a peace treaty on an agreed basis.

Of course, it will be with reluctance that the Soviet Government will conclude a peace treaty without the Western Powers' participation. It would sincerely welcome a revision of the Western Powers' position toward constructive actions jointly with the USSR on the question of a German peace treaty.

Last year, as is known, there were intentions to take up the problem of a German peace treaty at the conference of the heads of state of the Four Powers in Paris. The head of the Soviet Government did not go to that conference empty-handed. Everyone will remember, however, that the conference of the heads of the Four Powers could not take place in view of the provocative actions of the United States' former administration with regard to the Soviet Union. But the Soviet Government, taking into consideration specifically the change of government in the United States of America, never regarded as buried the idea of discussing the problem of a peace settlement with Germany. The Soviet

Government declares again that it is ready for talks aimed at the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

Unfortunately, the American note gives grounds for serious doubts that the United States Government is striving for such talks. The note, true enough, says that "the United States Government is always prepared to consider in concord with its allies through free talks the question of settling the unsolved problems of Germany." But as was the case formerly, objections are advanced then and there to the conclusion of a German peace treaty and to the settlement of the situation in West Berlin on this basis. All this is accompanied by remarks about "dangerous consequences," "serious threat to international peace," and even about how the NATO countries "may interpret" the steps of other states if they take the road of a peace settlement with Germany. What, in this case, is the worth of the assurances of the United States Government about its readiness for talks?

The question arises before the Soviet Government: what aims are pursued in all this?

Perhaps to create an atmosphere in which the profits of military monopolists in the United States would soar still higher? It is known that even now there is some talk at the top levels of the United States of the forthcoming increase in taxes, higher prices and the general lowering of the living standards of the population.

War psychosis, which is putting an increasingly marked stamp on the whole atmosphere in the United States and leading to the aggravation of the international situation, of course, pleases the militarist revanchist quarters in West Germany. Indeed, parliamentary elections are to be held there in a few months' time, and the party of Chancellor Adenauer has always tried to fish for the votes of the electors by riding the crest of the cold war.

If anyone expects in this way to bring pressure to bear on the Soviet Union. Entire responsibility for the possible dangerous threats is least of all applicable in the relations with the USSR, and that its use can only lead to the opposite results.

The Soviet Government has declared and declares again: it suggests the conclusion of peace and a peace treaty with Germany. If this or that power, or group of powers, takes action which will lead to dangerous consequences, it will not be the

Soviet Union. Entire responsibility for the possible dangerous consequences for the cause of peace, hinted at by the United States Government, will be borne by all those who take steps directed against peace. The Soviet Union and other peace-loving states will be in a position to uphold the just cause, their security and peace.

It is far from the Soviet Government's intention to aggravate the situation. On the contrary, it is striving for peace and the easing of international tensions through the conclusion of a German peace treaty and through peaceful cooperation between states. Ensurance of peace and peaceful coexistence of states has been and remains the basis of the entire foreign policy of the Soviet Union. It is by this principle that the Soviet Government is guided in its entire policy while setting the task of a peace settlement with Germany. It expresses the hope that the United States Government will approach this matter in all seriousness, and will, for its part, make a contribution to the cause of its joint settlement in the interests of peace.

RADIO AND TELEVISION SPEECH
BY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV, AUGUST 7, 1961

DEAR COMRADES:

Radio and television speeches by the statesmen of our country are becoming a fine tradition. Today I should like to tell you briefly about developments within our country, then to go on to the international situation.

In the first place, allow me cordially to congratulate all Soviet people upon a new and great victory—the successful completion of the flight of the spaceship Vostok II.

Major Gherman Stepanovich Titov aboard the satellite spaceship has accomplished an unparalleled journey through space which lasted more than 25 hours. After carrying out his assignment to the full, the cosmonaut landed in the predetermined area within the Soviet Union. This flight speaks for itself. As a result humanity has taken another major step toward the realization of interplanetary travel.

All the peoples on earth enthusiastically acclaim the remarkable victories of Soviet science and technology in the exploration of space.

Today an appeal has been published by the Central Committee of our Party, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government in connection with this historic victory of our people. Our country will celebrate the cosmonaut's heroic exploit on the day he returns to Moscow.

On behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU, the Presidium of the Supreme Soviet of the USSR and the Soviet Government, I once more warmly and cordially congratulate this brave son of our people and of the Party. I congratulate our remarkable scientists, designers, engineers and workers—all those whose work prepared and made possible this great new accomplishment to glorify our Soviet homeland.

Successes in Economic Construction

Dear comrades, now I should like to tell you about the work of our industry and about the situation in agriculture.

You will remember that the target figures of our Seven-Year Plan amazed the entire world by their scope. The Soviet Seven-Year Plan filled our friends with enthusiasm and joy. It threw into despondency the enemies of socialism. Thereupon ill-wishers abroad hastened in the usual fashion to proclaim the Seven-Year Plan unrealistic. Life has made a laughingstock of these imperialist loudmouths. Already our workers, collective farmers, engineers and scientists have by their remarkable achievements—and to the glory of our socialist homeland—not only confirmed the reality of the Seven-Year Plan but also added to it by increasing its original goals. These changes have put the pessimists and the ill-wishers in the capitalist world, to put it mildly, into a difficult position.

Permit me to cite some figures on the work of our industry, to quote indices that determine the economic potential of the state.

It is common knowledge that the plan for the first two years of the seven-year period was substantially overfulfilled. A statement on the successful fulfillment of the plan for the first six months of 1961—the third year of the Seven-Year Plan—was recently published in the press. During the first two and a half years, industrial production exceeded by 15 billion rubles the target set for this period by the Seven-Year Plan. Steel production was 7.6 million metric tons in excess of the plan, rolled sections, 6 million tons; oil, 8 million tons; reinforced concrete and concrete construction and structural components, 12 million cubic meters; cotton textiles, 900 million meters; and footwear, 53 million pairs. It is noteworthy that industrial output in the two and a half years of the Seven-Year Plan period was as great as that of the entire fifth Five-Year Plan period (1951-1955).

Overfulfillment of production goals and reduction in production costs have increased accumulation and made possible appropriations amounting to an additional three billion rubles for capital investment in light industry. The Seven-Year Plan envisages further rises in living standards, and this target too is being successfully met. Wage and social program funds are increasing and housing construction is proceeding on an unprecedented scale.

As you see, industry is working well and on the whole over-fulfilling plan targets. But there are still factories and mills which do not meet their quotas. This means that such enterprises are not making the necessary contribution to accomplishing the goal of fulfilling the Seven-Year Plan ahead of time. They are not marching in step with the tens of thousands of leading collectives. It is necessary to see to it that each factory, mill and mine, each collective farm and state farm, fulfills and overfulfills plan targets.

The Situation in Agriculture

Now I shall tell you how things are going in agriculture. In the last two years the output level of farm produce was below our potentialities. This created some difficulties in supplying towns with such products as meat, milk and fats. Many would like to know what the prospects are for this year, because higher living standards for the people depend largely on progress in agriculture.

The harvest and procurement of farm products during the current year promise to be larger than at any time since the establishment of Soviet power.

The total area sown to farm crops exceeds 204 million hectares. This is an all-time high. Corn for grain has been planted on an area of 7.7 million hectares, or 2.6 million hectares more than last year. The area sown to peas, cereals and fodder beans has been substantially enlarged. Harvesting is proceeding at a fast pace.

The number of cattle in the country at the beginning of the year was greater than in any previous year and equalled 75.8 million head, including 34.8 million cows; the number of pigs was 58.7 million, and the number of sheep, 133 million. These figures show we have a sound foundation for further advances in stockbreeding.

Recently I visited the Kuban Valley, the Rostov Region and the Ukraine and met with agricultural workers. I saw the fields and the results of the work the people have done. I talked with those who are responsible for our rich harvest.

I must say I was pleased by what I saw and I should like briefly to tell you about it.

Take the Ukraine. You will recall that at the January Plenary

Meeting of the Central Committee we did not spare the leaders of that big republic. We sharply criticized them for serious shortcomings in their work. The leading Ukrainian officials drew the correct communist conclusions from the criticism, reformed their ranks and mobilized the material and spiritual forces of the people. This year the republic is achieving great success in developing its agriculture. By August 5 the Ukraine's collective and state farms had sold to the state 552 million poods of grain, mainly wheat. Yet last year they sold to the state during the entire year only 359 million poods of grain, including corn. As Comrades Podgorny and Shcheritsky stated, the Ukraine will sell to the state several more tens of millions of poods of wheat, peas, millet and other cereals, legumes and groats. In other words, there will be an abundance of white bread or, as the Ukrainians say, there will be both dumplings and kasha.

The Ukrainians skillfully went in for such a powerful reserve as corn for increasing grain output. They substantially enlarged the area under this crop. In the Ukraine corn has been sown on an area of 7.3 million hectares this year and almost 4 million hectares will be harvested for grain. The corn has been well cultivated and is in excellent condition. If the collective and state farms properly organize their harvesting it will be possible to gather in over a billion poods of corn. As the Ukrainian comrades report, this will make it possible to sell 450 to 460 million poods of corn to the state.

Rational organization of labor and additional pay incentives have played a great role in expanding grain production in the Ukraine.

The working people of the Ukraine, her Communists and Young Communist League members displayed genuine heroism and organizational ability and were able to achieve great successes. This is also to the credit of the leadership of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of the Ukraine and the Council of Ministers of the Republic, regional and district committees of the Party, regional and district Executive Committees of the Soviets, economic councils, primary Party organizations, trade unions and the Young Communist League.

I should also like to share with you some other good news. I talked with Comrade Vorobyev, Secretary of the Krasnodar Ter-

ritorial Party Committee, and with Comrade Kolomiets, Chairman of the Territorial Executive Committee. They told me that according to preliminary data obtained after talking with workers in the district's collective farms and state farms, they expect this year to overfulfill the plan in selling grain to the state.

I also had an opportunity to talk with the leaders of the Stavropol Territory and of the Rostov, Belgorod, Kursk, Tula and Orel regions. In those territories and regions a good crop is being harvested. The collective and state farms of these districts expect to sell much more grain to the state than they did last year.

Good news about grain and corn harvests is coming in from collective and state farms in the Stalingrad, Saratov, Orenburg and other regions on the Volga and in the Urals.

The farmers of the Russian Federation as a whole are making a big contribution to expanding the output of grain and other farm products. By August 5, the collective and state farms of the Federation had sold to the state 779 million poods of grain, or 122 million more than by the same date last year. Comrades Voronov and Polyansky stated that the Russian Federation will fulfill its obligations with regard to the sale of grain to the state.

A few words about the virgin land development areas. Harvesting is only beginning there. As we know, in the areas of the Tselinny Territory and Siberia grain ripens much later and it would therefore be premature to mention specific figures. But the leaders of the republics, territories and regions of virgin land also say that the plans will be fulfilled and perhaps even overfulfilled.

Thus if the Russian Federation, the Ukraine and Kazakhstan fulfill their obligations—undertaken on the basis of a study of the condition of the crops—the state will be able to purchase about one billion poods of grain more than last year. Of course you realize how great a victory this will be for our people.

After setting aside adequate seed reserves and selling such a large amount of grain to the state, the collective farms, according to estimates by local officials, will nevertheless still have the necessary amounts of grain to distribute among the collective farmers in accordance with their workday units, for additional remuneration and also for livestock feed.

The main task in agriculture today is to harvest the entire

crop in time, to do it well and without losses, and to store it.

All the peoples of the Soviet Union are doing their utmost to ensure the steady continuation of successes in agriculture. You will see that this year we shall be able substantially to increase the output of farm products. And if there is grain, there will be fodder. That means stockbreeding will also expand and there will be more meat, milk and butter and the per capita supply for the population will improve.

At the same time we should take into consideration the shortcomings and difficulties related to this work, which we now see more clearly. We must make better use of our great potentials. Then we can solve even more successfully the problems of further rapid agricultural advances.

The Draft Program of the Communist Party

The prospects for the expansion of our entire national economy are magnificent. They are set forth in the Draft of the new Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. A comparatively short time has elapsed since this document was published and we shall therefore not anticipate events by making generalizations concerning appraisals of the Program within the country and abroad. Millions of people are attentively and eagerly studying the Draft Program which has had an impact on the entire world. For the first time in history our Party is setting the task of building a communist society as a practical task for the immediate future. The conclusion of the Program—that the present generation of Soviet people shall live under communism—fills us with joy and fresh strength.

We can say already with complete confidence that the entire Soviet people unanimously approve the Draft Program of our Party. Speaking at meetings, writing in the press, using the radio and television, Soviet people express pride and admiration for their Leninist Party and for their great socialist homeland. As they study the Draft Program, all Soviet citizens—especially people of the older generation—look back at the path our people have traversed in recent decades. From an economically and culturally backward country, our homeland has by the will and effort of the people grown into a mighty socialist power, the first to blaze the trail toward that great and cherished aim—communism.

Our success in the economy and in science and culture and our consistent peace-loving policy have immeasurably raised the international prestige of the land of the Soviets and its influence on world developments.

All the successes and victories of the peoples of the Soviet Union are the result of the realization by the Party of Lenin's wise heritage.

The new Draft Program breathes a spirit of creative communist endeavor, love of peace, internationalism. Our friends in all countries, the fraternal Marxist-Leninist Parties of the socialist and capitalist countries, are expressing their approval of the Program and emphasizing its historic significance for the international communist and labor movement. They regard the Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union as an outstanding document of our era, a major contribution to the development of Marxist-Leninist theory.

Not only our friends but also the enemies of communism are studying and appraising this new programmatic document. They are powerless to suppress it; they cannot conceal the tremendous impression produced by the Draft Program throughout the world.

Is it not remarkable that some leading U.S. Senators regard the Draft Program as "a serious challenge to the United States"? They never doubt that the Soviet Union will be able to achieve the aims established in it. They warn: "Do not underestimate the attractive power of the Draft Program." This is what the imperialists fear above everything else.

We are confident that the ideas of the new Program will reach the minds and the hearts of all the earth's people. There has been a most lively response to the inspiring words of the Program which say that communism is accomplishing its historic mission of delivering all men from social inequality, from every form of oppression and exploitation, from the horrors of war; that it proclaims peace, work, freedom, equality and happiness for all the peoples of the earth.

The main conclusion which the Soviet people themselves draw from studying the Draft Program is their need to work and again to work still harder so as to speed communist construction and strengthen the power and prosperity of our Soviet homeland.

The superiority of the socialist economy over the capitalist

economy is now being proved by more than theoretical arguments. The material evidence of this is already clear. From year to year the countries of the socialist community are demonstrating their superiority in the rate of economic growth, in development of scientific and technical thought, in raising the living standards of the working people and in many other fields.

Even at the time when the capitalist countries were economically far ahead of the Soviet Union, we Marxist-Leninists were firmly confident of the boundless possibilities of the socialist production system. Even at the time of the Civil War, when the country was fighting against economic dislocation and hunger cruelly gripped our people, Vladimir Ilyich Lenin's profound and unshakable faith in the superiority of the socialist system enabled him to challenge capitalism to economic competition and to advance the idea of peaceful coexistence between states with different social systems.

Those who are confident of the economic victory of their social system need not impose this system upon other peoples by force of arms. This is why we tell the leaders of capitalist states: Let the people themselves, let history settle the issue which system—the socialist or the capitalist—has greater vital power and is the more progressive. The people will make a free choice and that system shall prevail which will satisfy man's material and spiritual wants.

The Struggle for Peace

Far from being interested in war, the Soviet Union, as indeed the other socialist countries, is doing its utmost to create insurmountable obstacles to the unleashing of war by the imperialists. The communists have always regarded the struggle for peace as their paramount task. Our common convictions, demands and program of action are set forth in the Statement of the meeting of representatives of Communist and Workers' Parties held in Moscow last year. The ideologists of imperialism deliberately distort the meaning of this statement, slander the communists and attribute to them a desire to solve outstanding international disputes through war. All this is sickening. Anyone taking the trouble to get to the core of the documents of the meeting will realize that the socialist countries and all fraternal Communist Parties are resolute and convinced opponents of wars between

states. Our foreign policy is peaceful coexistence, not war. It is precisely the communists who want to eliminate war altogether. This is the true meaning of the Soviet proposals for general and complete disarmament. If we succeeded in coming to terms with the Western Powers on the question of general and complete disarmament under strict international control, this would also solve such problems as the ban on nuclear manufacture, tests of nuclear weapons and the complete destruction of stockpiles of atomic and hydrogen weapons.

But year follows year and no matter what disarmament committees and commissions are set up, there isn't a penny's worth of progress. Disarmament experts are stuck in the talks like flies in molasses. Why is that? Why do all the efforts of the Soviet Union and of other peaceloving countries aimed at achieving disarmament agreement come up against a dead wall of resistance on the part of the capitalist states? Because the imperialists have not abandoned the idea of armed struggle against socialism, against the peaceloving countries.

The quest for profits, the insatiable striving for riches and exploitation, gives rise to the imperialists' aggressive wars. After the Second World War capitalist monopolies made preparations for war; the armaments race became an integral part of their countries' economic development. In the face of the successes of the socialist countries the imperialists are today increasingly in the grip of fear, of hatred of communism. They abhor the magnificent achievements of the world system of socialism and the growth of a power so attractive to the peoples fighting for their freedom and independence. The concepts by which the capitalist world has existed until now are crumbling before the very eyes of the ideologists of imperialism. With each passing year the gap between the levels of industrial and agricultural production in the Soviet Union and the United States of America becomes narrower, and the day is not far off when we will catch up with the USA and start outdistancing it. Blinded by class hatred of socialist countries, some imperialist leaders proclaim anti-communism as the basis of their foreign policy. These are old tunes, familiar and reminiscent of the time of the "Anti-Comintern Pact," of the "Rome-Berlin Axis." But what is left of them? The Axis is broken and the mad authors of the "Anti-Comintern

Pact" have been thrown onto the dungheap of history!

The crux of the matter seems to be that the most aggressive imperialist circles would like to disrupt our plans for the peaceful construction of a communist society. It is capitalism that is afraid of peaceful competition between countries with different social systems.

The United States of America and other Western Powers are building for war. They are appropriating tremendous sums for armaments. In the last 12 years direct military expenditures in the United States have more than trebled. During the current year 53 billion dollars are to be appropriated for military requirements; the President of the United States recently requested an additional appropriation of 3.5 billion. According to official, obviously incomplete data, West Germany in the last decade spent on military expenditures approximately as much as Hitler did in the period from 1933 to the outbreak of World War II. In 1961 the military items in the budget of the Federal German Republic increased by another 18 per cent. Other imperialist powers are likewise spending tremendous sums on armaments. This shows that the imperialists are again trying to espouse Dulles' old policy of "rolling back" the socialist countries.

But the adherents of this policy should bear in mind the real balance of power which now obtains in the world. Mr. Kennedy, the President of the United States, said during our talks in Vienna that a balance of power had now been established between the two world camps and that a direct clash between the USSR and the United States must be prevented because such a clash would have the most disastrous consequences. In this instance Mr. Kennedy took a sober view of the situation and displayed a realistic attitude. This we must grant. But reality demands that statesmen not only make reasonable utterances but also refuse to cross the line where the voice of reason is silenced and a blind and dangerous game begins with the destinies of people and states.

The Necessity for a Peace Treaty with Germany

We cannot view with indifference the way the aggressive circles in the Western Powers are, with Chancellor Adenauer's help, mobilizing all the material and spiritual forces of West Germany

toward preparation of a third world war. The Federal German Republic is no longer the country which 16 years ago bowed its head to the victors and pledged to follow the road of peace and democracy. Today the West German revanchists are raising their heads. They have a mass army which is being trained and equipped for offensive operations. The Federal German Republic has become a party to the North Atlantic military bloc directed against the Soviet Union and the other socialist countries. Militarization, an orgy of revanchist passions, the cult of hatred and enmity for communism and everything that is new and progressive, a revival of pan-German traditions and sentiments—that is what today determines the face of the West German state.

By the will of the Western Powers more inflammable material has been stockpiled in the center of Europe than in any other region of the world. It is here that the flame of a world war again threatens to break out.

Now that the Western Powers have trampled underfoot allied agreements on the demilitarization and democratization of Germany, only a peace treaty can forestall the dangerous development of German militarism and revanchism. That is why we propose that the Soviet Union, the United States, Britain, France, Poland, Czechoslovakia, Yugoslavia and all the countries that took part in the war against Hitler Germany on the one hand, and the German Democratic Republic and the Federal German Republic as the lawful successor to the former German Reich on the other, conclude a peace treaty which would meet the legitimate interests of all sides. This would make it possible, while observing all legal standards and international customs, to put an absolute end to the state of war and to clear the way for peace and peaceful coexistence in Europe.

The conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany would make it possible to normalize the situation in West Berlin and thus to remove the grounds for sharp clashes between states. We must not permit West Berlin to become a kind of Sarajevo, the Serbian town where the shot rang out that announced the outbreak of the First World War. It would not affect either the interests or the prestige of any state for West Berlin to be made a free city, as the Soviet Union suggests. We propose that it be stipulated in

the peace treaty that the free city of West Berlin be granted freedom of communication with the outside world. We agree to the establishment of any effective guarantees for the independent development and safeguarding of the free city of West Berlin.

While insisting on the conclusion of a peace treaty, the Soviet Government declares: We stand for the freedom of West Berlin, but not on the basis of maintenance of the military occupation status. It is common knowledge that occupation has never meant freedom and never will. For it is said with good reason that "it is awkward to sit on bayonets."

All Eastern neighbors of Germany agree on the need for concluding a German peace treaty and granting West Berlin the status of a free city. The government of the German Democratic Republic on whose territory West Berlin is situated also agrees to our proposals and has issued a statement to this effect. The Western Powers replied with a refusal. They did not, however, advance any counterproposals for a peace settlement with Germany. It would be well worth their while to consider the dangerous upsurge of West Germany and to look back, too. For is it not a matter of fact that after the First World War the Western Powers also helped Germany, in the hope that she would march towards the East? However, this did not prevent her from directing arms first of all against those who helped German militarism to get back on its feet or from unleashing a war for world domination.

Both the Yalta Declaration and the Potsdam Agreement clearly established that the occupation of Germany must help the German people eradicate militarism and Nazism. The Western Powers violated all principles regarding the occupation of Germany agreed upon at Yalta and Potsdam. The conspiracy by the Western Powers late in 1946 on the merger of the two occupation zones was the beginning of the division of Germany and the restoration of the power of the militarists and revanchists in West Germany. The Western Powers irrevocably and unilaterally tore up the Potsdam Agreement by setting up a separate West German state, concluding the Paris Agreements and including West Germany in NATO. It is no accident that in connection with this a special tripartite occupation status was established for West Berlin. By means of this occupation status

the Western Powers confirmed that they had themselves destroyed the foundations under international law of their occupation regime in West Berlin, and that this regime now rests solely on undisguised armed force.

The Question of German Self-Determination

The governments of the United States, Britain and France recently replied to the memorandum on the German question handed to President Kennedy at our meeting in Vienna. The Western Powers are once again seeking to evade concluding a peace treaty. They counterpose the idea of German self-determination and the reunification of Germany. It would be fine if this German self-determination were being advocated by genuine friends of the people's freedom and independence. But it is strange, to say the least, to hear the call for self-determination coming from those who for centuries have kept peoples enslaved, retaliating with bullets and whips to any attempt by those peoples to throw off foreign oppression and achieve self-determination.

"Self-determination" is being advocated by the very imperialists and colonialists who for several years shed the blood of the Vietnamese people, who for seven years have waged predatory war in Algeria, who are shooting down unarmed people in Bizerte and Tunisia merely because the Tunisians have demanded evacuation of the imperialists' military base from their territory. It is they who organized the bloody massacre of the patriots of the Congo who rose to the struggle for independence; it was they who killed the national hero Patrice Lumumba. The struggle in the Congo continues. Colonialists are seeking to crush with fire and sword the liberation movement of the people of Angola. And was it not those who are now trying to pose as champions of self-determination who organized the armed attack on Egypt?

There is a great outcry over the slogan of self-determination in the United States, whose ruling circles follow a policy of suppressing liberation movements on several continents. It was by the will of the American monopolies that the tyrannical regime of Batista, detested by the Cubans, was established in Cuba. And when the Cuban people rose and expelled the dicta-

tor, the American imperialists repeatedly tried through military intervention to crush the Cuban Revolution and suppress the people's aspirations for genuine freedom, genuine self-determination. The whole world knows how the American monopolies carried out the operation for "self-determination" in Guatemala, an operation conducted by hired thugs, by armed forces directed against the Guatemalan people. We could cite quite a few examples of imperialist interference in the internal affairs of other countries. There is, for example, the forcible seizure of Taiwan Island, an integral part of the People's Republic of China. There is the interference in the domestic affairs of Laos, of South Vietnam, South Korea and many African and Latin American countries. If all this is defense of self-determination, what, then, is colonial brigandage!

It is the dyed-in-the-wool enemies of the national unity of the German people who right now are concerned with speculating on the slogan of self-determination. Today this slogan is constantly on the lips of Chancellor Adenauer, who has a most definite interpretation of it—the swallowing up of the German Democratic Republic. How can an agreement be reached on reunification if the West German government turns a deaf ear to the very idea of talks with the government of the German Democratic Republic?

The Soviet people will never forget how during the last war Nazi units hid behind the backs of our women and children whom they drove in front of themselves during attack. In the same way the West German militarists now want to hide their plans for revenge behind the lofty slogans of self-determination, to mask these plans with them: you just try, they seem to say to us, to attack self-determination.

The Soviet Union fully understands how dear to the German people is the cause of German national unity. This unity can be achieved only by the Germans themselves. The Western Powers would like to persuade us that they stand for reunification. But those who truly stand for German reunification will not reserve for themselves the right to intervene in what is exclusively the internal affair of the German people, as did the governments of the United States, Britain and France under the Paris Agreements of 1954. At that time the government of the

Federal German Republic willingly sacrificed the Germans' national interests in exchange for participation in NATO.

It is significant that the government of the Federal German Republic most persistently clamors for revision of those articles of the Paris Agreements which put restrictions on West Germany's arms production. But it never even raised the question of rescinding those articles which leave to the Western Powers the final say on matters of reunification. Yet after all this the government of the German Federal Republic and the Western Powers pretend that they have no other concern but German unity, with self-determination thrown in for good measure.

What will they think up next in the West in order to distort our position on a peace treaty with Germany?

President Kennedy's Speech

In his recent speech the President of the USA said that the United States faces a challenge of some kind from the Soviet Union; that the freedom of West Berlin is being threatened; that the Soviet Union is all but ready to use force. But he said not a single word about the substance of the matter—namely, that the Soviet Union proposes to conclude a peace treaty with Germany and is trying to work out the terms of this treaty jointly with all states that took part in the war against Germany. After listening to the speech of their President the American people might indeed get the idea that it is not the vestiges of the last war we want to eliminate but rather to start a third world war.

Which provisions in the Soviet draft peace treaty with Germany could conceivably give the American President a pretext to claim that the Soviet Union “threatens” to violate peace? Could it be those which envisage Germany's renouncing nuclear weapons; or final legalization of the existing German borders; or granting full sovereignty to both German states and admitting them to the United Nations?

If anyone did allow himself to resort to threats, it was the President of the United States. Nor did he hesitate to present us something in the way of an ultimatum in reply to our proposal to conclude a German peace treaty. As if to reinforce his threats, the President announced an increase of the strength of the armed forces by 217,000 men, while American senators started to

trumpet about the need for mobilizing certain classes of reservists.

Military hysteria is now being drummed up in the United States. At the same time, there are those who are conditioning the American people to the idea that there would be nothing particularly terrible even if war does break out. But it would be criminal thoughtlessness for American leaders seriously to believe that once unleashed, war against the socialist states could possibly be kept within certain bounds. If a clash does occur between the two giants—the USSR and the USA—possessed of powerful economies and great stockpiles of nuclear weapons, it goes without saying that neither side would be ready to admit defeat without having used all weapons, including the most destructive ones. Do the American people really need this? Does the American government really want it? But if the United States leaders do realize the full meaning of modern warfare involving the use of thermonuclear weapons, why do they raise the atmosphere to a state of red heat, as President Kennedy has done in his speech?

The Danger of a Third World War

Should a third world war break out, it would naturally not be confined to a duel between the two great powers, the Soviet Union and the United States of America. Is it not a fact that already dozens of states are entangled in the net of military alliances established by the United States, states which would inevitably find themselves drawn into the orbit of the war? We are taking all this into account and should the imperialists unleash a war, we have at our disposal the necessary combat means not only for striking a crushing blow at the territorial United States, but also to render harmless the aggressor's allies and destroy American military bases throughout the world.

Any state which would be used as a springboard for an attack on the socialist camp will experience the full devastating power of our blow. War will also come home to the American people who for a century, since the time of their own Civil War, have not known hostilities on their territory. We do not want to threaten anyone. We only want to stimulate some reasonable thinking among those upon whom the policy of NATO member states depends.

Even politicians to whom peaceful aspirations are alien realize the terrible consequences a third world war would have for their countries. I should like to refer to Defense Minister Strauss of the Bonn Government. Addressing newsmen on one occasion, Strauss admitted: "War would mean the destruction of Germany and other European countries." The defense minister is right. Having made such a statement he should himself have renounced warlike aspirations and advised Chancellor Adenauer, who is now playing with fire, to do the same.

Comrades, it must be said frankly that at present the Western Powers are pushing the world to a dangerous divide and the emergence of the threat of an armed attack by imperialists on socialist states cannot be ignored.

I should like to assure you that the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government are doing and will do everything in their power to prevent war from breaking out. But not everything depends on us. If there really comes a moment when imperialism would dare to commit an act of madness and unleash a military gamble, a highly dangerous situation to the entire world may develop. We must be on our guard.

We are convinced that if the question of whether or not there will be a war depends on reasonable people in the Western countries, they would not allow war to break out. But if people possessed by suicidal mania take the upper hand, one cannot vouch for them.

In this connection I should like to recall an instance from the time of the Great Patriotic War which shows what can result from the loss of self-possession, from the loss of the power of reason.

In the first days after Hitler Germany's attack on the Soviet Union I was a member of the Military Council of the South-Western Front. You will remember that at the start of the war events were not developing in our favor; Soviet troops found themselves in a difficult position. And it happened that on the fifth or sixth day of the war the commander of the front and I sent General Vashugin, a member of the Military Council, to one of the tank corps to convey orders on how to use the forces of this corps in the best way possible. Upon his return, Vashugin called on me. He was in a very grave and confused state. "Every-

thing is lost. Things are going on as they did in France. This is the end. I will shoot myself," he said. I tried to stop him: "You are crazy; come to your senses!" But before I had time to do anything he drew his pistol and shot himself right there before my eyes.

This tragedy occurred because the man was thoroughly unnerved. He no longer knew what he was doing and lost his self-control. I do not mean to draw a direct analogy, but in the West there are some people who are losing their self-possession and self-control. In the story I have just told it was one man who perished. But under present conditions, were some Western leaders to act recklessly and push the world into a new war, such a suicidal act would spell death to millions upon millions of people.

Some Implications of a German Peace Treaty

Let us then see why signing a German peace treaty is so urgent for the consolidation of world peace. What would happen if the German peace treaty were put off for several more years? It would mean giving in to the forces of aggression, retreating under their pressure. Such a position would still further encourage NATO and the Bonn Government to form more and more military divisions in West Germany, to equip them with atomic and thermonuclear weapons, to convert West Germany into the main force for unleashing a new world war.

It is not because the Soviet Union is seeking special privileges for itself that it insists on the signing of a German peace treaty without delay. We do not intend to seize West Berlin; our goal is not to alter the present frontiers of Germany; we have no designs on West Germany. All we want is to strengthen peace through the conclusion of a German peace treaty.

Should the Western Powers reconsider their position, follow the voice of reason and express readiness to conclude a peace treaty together with us, we shall be only too happy. If they have any suggestions or amendments to offer to our draft peace treaty, or have their own proposals on this question, we are ready not only to listen but also to discuss all their considerations most thoroughly. We do not want to impinge in the least on the lawful interests of the Western Powers; we do not propose to alter the

state borders which took shape after World War II. This I proclaim once more today on behalf of the Soviet Government.

But if the Western Powers persist in refusing to sign a German peace treaty we shall have to settle this problem without them. The other day a conference took place in Moscow of the First Secretaries of the Central Committees of Communist and Workers' Parties of the Warsaw Treaty Countries. They exchanged views on matters involving the preparations for signing a German peace treaty. The communiqué on this conference states that if the Western Powers continue to evade the conclusion of a German peace treaty, the states concerned would be compelled to conclude a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic.

It goes without saying that in such a case the German Democratic Republic would attain full sovereignty, and therefore questions of the use of communications with West Berlin, running across its territory, would have to be decided by agreement with the GDR government. The agreements between the USSR and the Western Powers on the question of access to West Berlin during the occupation period will become null and void. It would seem that all this is natural and quite fair and should not raise objections on anyone's part. For is it not a fact that it is impossible to use communications on the territory of a state without dealing with the government of that state? This would be completely abnormal and would run counter to the elementary principles of international law.

But American statesmen are saying that the Soviet Union, by concluding a peace treaty with the GDR, allegedly wants in some way to humiliate America, Great Britain and France; that it is impossible for America's representatives to ask the Germans for permission to communicate with West Berlin because they together with the peoples of the Soviet Union once fought against Hitler Germany. They even declare that the position of the USSR on this question is against the principles of comradeship and is immoral.

But the arguments are absolutely inconsistent! First, if we are to speak about ethics and legal grounds, I should like to point to an example set us by the United States and other allies of ours in the war against Japan, when they concluded a separate peace treaty with Japan and deprived us of all rights stemming

from her surrender, including the right to participate in the agencies controlling Japan's fulfillment of her surrender terms. It would thus seem that there are two sets of ethics, two approaches—one for themselves and another for us.

Second, on what grounds do the Americans claim—as one of their statesmen told me outright—that on the question of access to West Berlin they cannot deal with the GDR government because allegedly this government was elected by undemocratic procedure. This is crude slander. However there is no sense in arguing with the ruling circles of the United States of America regarding the principles of democracy. Our approaches to this matter are vastly different. The United States for instance maintains friendly, allied relations with such “great democrats of the free world” as the fascists Franco and Salazar.

Incidentally we too are obliged to deal with governments with which we have no friendly relations. But we do deal with them. I can cite one such example: the Soviet Union had to enter into negotiations with the German Federal Republic in order to ensure through train traffic on the Moscow-Paris line via the territory of West Germany. And what of it? We did come to terms and signed an appropriate agreement with the FRG government. At present the direct Moscow-Paris railway line is functioning effectively. In the given instance we acted as realists. Although there had been a hard-fought war against Germany, it is long since over and therefore it is necessary to normalize relations and reckon with a practical existing situation.

The question of the right to dispose of the territory of a state is not a question for third countries to decide, but is rather for the people of the state itself and must be settled by the government representing this people. In the case I just mentioned we dealt with Adenauer because he represents the Federal German Republic, just as Comrade Ulbricht represents the German Democratic Republic and will have to be dealt with on the question of access to West Berlin after the signing of a peace treaty. This is a realistic fact stemming from international law and it cannot be disregarded.

I should like once more to repeat that in concluding a peace treaty with the GDR we do not intend to infringe upon any lawful interests of the Western Powers. Barring access to West

Berlin or a blockade of West Berlin are entirely out of the question. All this is only a figment of the imagination on the part of those who want to heat the atmosphere in order to prepare a new war. But the peoples will see whose efforts are aimed at consolidating peace and whose at fanning the passions and preparing World War III.

What is the reason for the outcry? Why have the Western Powers raised such an uproar in connection with our intention, after conclusion of a peace treaty, to turn over to the GDR full sovereignty over communications leading to West Berlin? Why should they even attempt to threaten us and talk about a test of strength? Taking a closer look at what is going on, we cannot fail to draw the conclusion that much more basic issues are at stake. The imperialists do not want to recognize the fact that the German Democratic Republic is entitled as a sovereign state to exercise full control over its entire territory. The imperialists believe that the present situation provides them with a convenient loophole to obstruct the development of the GDR as a socialist state. They are using West Berlin as a base for subversion against the GDR and other socialist countries; they are sending over their agents; they continually aggravate the military situation there. The imperialists think of nothing but ways and means to enlarge the loophole, to undermine the German Democratic Republic. But they are told: "Stop, gentlemen. We know exactly what you want, what you are after; we shall sign a peace treaty and close your loophole in the GDR!"

There are those who might say: "But is it at all necessary to sign a peace treaty with Germany now? Why not wait another two or three years or even longer? Perhaps that would eliminate tension, remove the danger of war?" No, this line of action is impossible. The truth must be faced: The Western Powers refuse to conclude a peace treaty with Germany on an agreed basis. At the same time they threaten war and demand that we for our part not conclude a peace treaty with the GDR. They want nothing more and nothing less than to impose their will on the countries of the socialist camp. To them the whole question of access to West Berlin and of the peace treaty is only a pretext. Were we to renounce the signing of a peace treaty, they would regard this as a strategic breakthrough and would at once broaden

the range of their demands. They would demand liquidation of the socialist system in the German Democratic Republic. Were they to get that too, they would of course set themselves the goal of annexing from Poland and Czechoslovakia the territories restored to them under the Potsdam Agreement. Yet these are Polish and Czechoslovak lands. And were the Western Powers to attain all this, they would advance their main claim: the abolition of the socialist system in all countries of the socialist camp. This is what they would like to do right now.

That is why the settlement of the question of a peace treaty cannot be postponed. The conclusion of a peace treaty with the GDR will be of tremendous positive significance in the overall international situation. Like the needle of a compass, the peace treaty will indicate to the entire German people the true direction of developments, ensuring for them peace, freedom, independence and sovereignty in the community of peace-loving peoples of Europe.

Strengthening the Soviet Armed Forces

We turn to our own people and frankly tell them about the present situation. You already know that the Soviet Government has decided to increase defense expenditures, to discontinue cuts in our Armed Forces which until now we were carrying out unilaterally. In a word, essential measures are being taken in order to make the defense power of the Soviet Union still stronger and more dependable. We shall watch further developments and act in accordance with the existing situation. We may even eventually have to increase the numerical strength of the army at the Western borders by transferring divisions from other parts of the Soviet Union. In this connection it will perhaps be necessary to call up a part of our reservists in order to bring our divisions to their full complement and have them ready for any surprises.

Why does the Soviet Government consider such measures? These are measures in the nature of a reply. The United States of America is in fact carrying out mobilization measures; it is threatening to unleash a war. The U.S. allies in military aggressive blocs are supporting this dangerous course. The British Government has announced that it will transfer additional troops to West Germany. France is recalling troops from Algeria.

With such a situation taking shape, it would be impermissible for us to sit with arms folded. The experience of history teaches that when an aggressor sees that he is not being opposed he grows more brazen. Contrarywise when he meets opposition, he calms down. It is this historic experience that must guide us in our actions.

We are confident that all Soviet people will understand correctly the measures the Soviet Government is taking and will assume a serious view of the present situation. While fighting for the cause of communism, defending the independence of their homeland during the stern years of the war, the Soviet people developed the great Leninist ability to be optimistic, to keep their faith in the triumph of Marxist-Leninist ideas. We are strong and we know that although difficulties may arise we shall overcome them and score new victories in the construction of communism.

Soviet citizens might want to know whether it is necessary to appropriate still larger funds for strengthening our Armed Forces. I am in a position to reply that for the present the Central Committee and the Government are inclined to think this is unnecessary. The funds already appropriated for strengthening the defenses of our homeland, the arms already created and in the process of being created by our industry will suffice. While carrying out defense measures, while strengthening the power of our socialist homeland, we are creating a variety of rockets: ballistic, intercontinental, tactical, with atomic and hydrogen warheads. Rocketry in our country might be said to be developing well and therefore we are not in need of additional appropriations. Proper attention is also being given in our country to other kinds of military technology.

In our socialist country the interests of the people and of the Government are indivisible. We shall not force the people to shoulder needless burdens unjustified by the interests of our cause.

Naturally the Soviet Government, like the Soviet people, does not want a war psychosis to make the peoples of the world—including those of the United States of America, France, Britain and West Germany—to live through excruciating days of tension. We are doing and shall continue to do everything in our power to

settle major international issues peacefully, in an atmosphere of calm.

Appeal for Peaceful Relations

The Soviet Union does not want to go to war with anyone. We do not need anyone's territories, anyone's wealth. How could we covet the wealth of others when the Soviet Union possesses vast natural resources, a highly developed industry, wonderful cadres of scientists, engineers, technicians, workers and farmers?

How many times, officially and unofficially, have spokesmen of the Soviet Government and our public organizations told the United States of America, its government and its people: "Let us trade, let us develop economic and cultural contacts. The United States of America is rich and strong and we are rich and strong. When relations between us enter a calm channel, the peoples of all countries benefit."

This is why we once again say to the governments of the United States of America, Britain and France: "Let us honestly meet at a round table conference; let us not create a war psychosis; let us clear the atmosphere; let us rely on reason and not on the power of thermonuclear weapons." We respect the American people whose soldiers fought together with Soviet soldiers in the trying days of struggle against fascist armies. We remember and know the contribution made by the British people to the rout of Hitlerism. We respect France and the great French people, we revere the heroic sons of France, our worthy combat allies who refused to bow to Hitler even when their country was occupied. And we of course remember how the Poles, the Czechs, the Yugoslavs and the other peoples of Europe fought against fascist invaders.

We should like to address the peoples and governments of neutral countries and say to them: "You cannot stand aside. It is only through the combined efforts of all peoples that it will be possible to put the aggressor into a straitjacket and rid humanity of the threat of a third world war. It is only through the efforts of all peoples and governments that the triumph of the great principles of peaceful coexistence can be assured, that agreement on general and complete disarmament under strict international controls can be achieved. On the question of

whether or not there shall be a war, neither governments nor peoples can remain neutral."

Such is the situation in which we live today; such is the world of the middle of 1961 with its troubles and anxieties. If we consider whether there have been equally complex situations in the past, whether we succeeded in resolving them reasonably and without resorting to war, historical experience indicates that similar situations have indeed occurred and that reason has triumphed. The Central Committee of our Party and the Soviet Government have done and will continue to do everything in their power so that the Soviet people and the peoples of all countries might bypass this critical moment too without war. We do not want war, but our people will not waver in the face of trials. It will meet force with force and crush any aggressor. We cannot allow ourselves to be complacent; we cannot expect anything to blow over of its own accord. Only determination, persistence, firm faith in the justice of our cause, devotion of the ideas of Marxism-Leninism, unity behind the Party and the Soviet Government—only these will make us ever stronger and help us surmount the obstacles in our path.

We are concerned with peaceful matters, preparing for the Twenty-Second Congress of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union, a congress the whole significance of which will be an affirmation of further vast peaceful plans for our existence.

Let it be known to everyone that we shall continue to work in the name of peace; that the entire Soviet people will raise its voice, will concentrate its efforts on preserving peace, on preventing the outbreak of a new war.

Allow me on behalf of the Central Committee of the CPSU and the Soviet Government to address all Soviet citizens in whatever capacity they work, wherever they happen to be, with this appeal: Let us strengthen the power of our beloved socialist homeland. May the work, energy and talent of each of us flow into the common stream of labor. As the ocean is made up of drops, so the power of the Soviet State is made up of the efforts of millions of Soviet citizens. This is the guarantee of our continued victories in the construction of communism.

I wish you all successes in work and in life, dear comrades!

ADDRESS BY N. S. KHRUSHCHEV AT A SOVIET-
RUMANIAN FRIENDSHIP MEETING AT THE
GRAND KREMLIN PALACE, AUGUST 11, 1961*

Comrades, our Rumanian friends are visiting here at a time when the Soviet people are preparing for the 22nd Congress of the Communist Party, which will be a great event in the life of our homeland. The Congress will adopt a new Party *Program*, a program for the construction of communism. Now our Party and all Soviet people are enthusiastically discussing this historic document. As always when important issues are at stake, the Party is consulting the working people and relying on the collective wisdom of the people.

The Communist Party of the Soviet Union, its Central Committee, the Soviet Government, the people of our country, as well as the people of all socialist countries are devoting their efforts toward the still further advancement of the economy and culture, in order to make the life of the people still better and more beautiful. We not only want to live happily ourselves, but by our labor we are paving the way to the happiness of the generations to come. Our goals are peaceful and majestic. Therefore we come out against war. War means death, it means destruction. Modern war would throw humanity back from its achievements in economic and cultural development for many, many years.

What does it mean to pave the way to a bright future? It means to fight for social progress, for the all-round development of the economy and culture, to storm ever new heights in science and technology. We describe mankind's progress towards the future as communist development. Every country and every nation has its own view of the future. People may describe it differently and approach it in different ways. But we, the Communists, are sure that all mankind will come to the most just society — to communism.

*The first part of this speech dealing with Soviet-Rumanian relations has been omitted—Editor.

The question now being debated in the world is this: under which social system is it possible to ensure a fair distribution of all the benefits created by labor, to ensure a situation in which neither the poor nor the rich exist and there is not a trace of envy or even of animosity? We, the Communists, believe that such a society will be a communist society in which a man will be a brother to another man and not a wolf as he is in the capitalist world, where everyone is trying to snatch a large or small lump from his neighbor.

The disputable issue — which system will give more material and spiritual values to the people — must be settled not on the battlefield but in peaceful competition. The people themselves will choose the social system which achieves better results in this competition.

The Draft Program of the Soviet Communist Party

This is precisely what is said in the *Draft Program of the Communist Party* of our country. The provisions of the *Program* are meant primarily for our Party, for our people. They are our conscience, our aspirations and our world outlook. The *Program* of the Party is a result of pondering by all Soviet Communists. Every Communist after consulting himself, so to speak, said: this is the path we shall follow and fight for to achieve the goal set by Marx, Engels and Lenin; this is how we shall build a communist society.

I repeat, the *Program of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union* is a program of action for our Party and our people, but all honest men and women who are willing to understand us correctly will see in it many lofty principles common to all humanity. There are, of course, people who do not agree with our philosophic views, but if they are honest people they cannot deny that the *Program* of our Party is imbued with humaneness, that this document speaks of the development of society not through war but through peaceful competition, through the mobilization of human strength and intellect for the development of material production, science, technology and culture.

The Draft of the new *Program* is convincing evidence of the tremendous possibilities of the socialist system. It shows that a long, glorious and difficult way has been traversed by the Soviet people in the struggle for a new life.

Recall the year 1919. Russia was in ruins at that time, and its people went hungry and barefoot. The flaming ring of counter-revolution and intervention threatened to strangle the young Republic of the Soviets — the land of the Great October. A man was satisfied in those days if he could get two ounces of black bread and a pinch of salt.

And at that great and hard time the Eighth Congress of our Party was convened in Moscow.

From its rostrum, Lenin unfolded before the delegates, before the entire Soviet people, a magnificent, moving picture of Russia's transformation along socialist lines. There were many people then, especially abroad, who doubted the reality of the program put forward by the Bolsheviks. Even H. G. Wells, who was so bold in his fantastic novels, did not believe in the reality of the plans of the "Kremlin dreamer." To think that a man who in his vision had penetrated into outer space, into the depths of time, could not bring himself to believe in the creative force of socialism! Our plans seemed incredibly bold and daring to him.

But years went by and the amazed world saw great changes taking place in the entire vast territory of the former Russian empire. By their dedicated work, the Soviet people have transformed their motherland into a mighty industrial socialist power, and we are now equal to any task.

It is no accident that the Soviet people have been the first to penetrate outer space. Only a few days ago the capital of our motherland, our entire country, gave a hero's welcome to its glorious son Gherman Stepanovich Titov who, following Yuri Gagarin, made an unprecedented voyage into space.

The exploits of our cosmonauts reflect the great achievements of the Soviet economy, its science and technology. They demonstrate the great advantages of the socialist system. The genius and labor of Soviet scientists, engineers, workers and collective farmers are making erstwhile dreams a reality.

Yes, Communists are indeed bold dreamers! But they are sober realists in their dreams, they are practical men, closely connected with the people, with life. Our *Program* is based on the solid foundation of what has already been achieved, on the solid foundation of science and technology. Its realization depends not on

God's grace, as people used to say in the past, but on the will, energy and labor of workers, peasants and intellectuals.

The building of communism in the Soviet Union is the living, creative cause of millions of men; it is one of the deepest and mightiest popular movements in the entire history of mankind. The enthusiasm of the Soviet people for labor, their firm determination to give all their strength to the building of communism is a guarantee that the plans set by the Party will be realized.

Faith in the justice of our cause enables the Soviet people to tell the capitalist world without any hesitation: let us compete in conditions of peace, without threats of war, without the tools of war!

The *Program* of our Party strikes a shattering blow at all those who seek to sow mistrust in the Soviet Union and its peaceful policy. For it is now clear even to the uninitiated that stable peace is required for the realization of the majestic program of building communism which is put forward by the Party.

The Soviet Government proposes to the governments of the Western Powers the joint settlement of all questions on which we disagree, which cannot be left unsettled to produce friction between states and breed tensions in the world.

Meeting with Italian Statesmen

In this connection I would like to say a few words about the talks I had with Prime Minister of Italy Mr. Fanfani and the Minister of Foreign Affairs Mr. Segni. These were useful talks. In the course of these conversations, we did not feel that friction which is possible at meetings of representatives of states with different social systems. It is known that friction causes the heating of bodies and fire can appear. Even ancient people knew this rule and obtained fire by following it. But friction between states can result in the conflagration of war.

Speaking of our states — Italy, a capitalist state, and the Soviet Union, a socialist state — they are, so to speak, heterogeneous bodies. But in our talks we agreed that people need peace and that it must be consolidated along the principles of peaceful co-existence. It is my impression that Mr. Fanfani strives for the peaceful settlement of disputable issues.

But the statesmen must take a realistic view of the difficulties

confronting them. All the more so now, since we are approaching the moment when the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany is necessary.

It would seem that everyone must be glad that a peace treaty will be concluded with Germany and the remnants of World War II thus be removed. But here certain difficulties arise. Indeed, Italy is a member of NATO — an aggressive bloc dominated by German revanchists, the survivals of Hitler Germany. The United States of America encourages the German revanchists and this is fraught with great danger.

When we were speaking with Mr. Fanfani about trade, we both stressed that trade was developing well and that there are good prospects for improving it. We said that the Soviet people love and understand the nature, culture and art of Italy. I also remarked that we like Italian oranges and that they are indeed delicious. I asked Mr. Fanfani where American rockets are located in Italy. Mr. Fanfani replied that they are stationed precisely in orange groves.

The Soviet people have no enmity for the Italian people. On the contrary we would like to live in peace and friendship with the people of Italy. But that country has been drawn into the aggressive Atlantic bloc which threatens us with war in the event of the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany.

The laws of war are cruel. I repeat, we have nothing against the Italian people and we sincerely wish them luck and happiness. But if the aggressive circles of the United States of America and Adenauer engineer a clash between our peoples, then, in defending our security, we shall have to strike at the NATO military bases wherever they are situated, even if they are in the orange groves. And then, not only the orange groves of Italy but also the people who created them and raised to a high level the culture and arts of Italy, the people in whose good feelings we believe, may perish.

NATO Bases on Greek Soil

..

On two occasions I had the opportunity to talk with the Greek Ambassador at receptions. The Slav peoples of our country — the Russians, the Ukrainians and the Byelorussians — have developed fraternal sentiments for the Greek people. In ancient times Prince

Vladimir of Kiev sent out special envoys to choose a religion. On returning home they said that the Greek religion was the best. But now we shall not analyze the conclusions of the envoys who reported to Prince Vladimir. We have our own opinion about religion but in this case there is no necessity to speak of it. As you will remember from history, the "christening of Russia" took place. Therefore one of the streets in Kiev is called *Kreshchatik*. They say that it was along this way that Vladimir drove people to the Dnieper to be christened. And they were christened not only with a cross but also with sticks because many people then did not want to accept the new religion. And that's how we came to be christened.

Along with religion, much of Greek culture and customs penetrated into our country. We never had any conflicts with the Greek people. More than that, when the Greeks were fighting for their independence, we were fully on their side. The Russian people shed their blood in the struggle for the liberation of the Greek people from foreign enslavers.

During World War II, when Hitler attacked Greece, the people of the Soviet Union admired the heroism of the Greek people who did not kneel to the fascist barbarians. We know that when the Soviet Union was attacked by the Hitlerites, the Greek people sympathized with our struggle and made their contribution to the common cause of the peoples' struggle against fascism.

But then the world war was over and fascism was routed. It would seem that the people who had gallantly fought against Hitler Germany earned profound respect and honor. But unfortunately, many of them — for instance, the hero of the Acropolis, Manolis Glezos — have been imprisoned. We have no desire to interfere in the internal affairs of Greece. This is against our custom. But we, the Soviet people, as well as the people of other countries who shed much blood in the struggle against fascism, cannot remain indifferent onlookers when a man whose heroic act added a golden page to the history of the struggle for independence is languishing in the torture chamber.

In my talks with the Ambassador I said that our peoples had always been brothers and we had always wished the Greeks the same happiness as ourselves. And yet the Government of Greece

has allied itself with NATO — the aggressive North Atlantic bloc.

We know that on the territory of Greece there are military bases spearheaded against the Soviet Union. And now that the ruling quarters of the United States and Adenauer are increasing tension and threaten to unleash war if a peace treaty with Germany is signed, we are threatened on behalf of the entire bloc, on behalf of all NATO countries. Consequently we are threatened with war even by such countries as Greece, Italy, Norway, Denmark, Belgium and Holland, not to speak of such European countries as France, Britain and West Germany.

We shall, of course, sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic. If the imperialist states unleash a war they will force us, in self-defense, to strike crushing blows not only at the territories of the principal countries but also at the military bases located on the territories of other countries belonging to the North Atlantic alliance. But it is well known that military bases are not located in deserts. In Italy they are reportedly located among citrus trees and in Greece among olive groves.

Perhaps there are some who expect that certain cities would be proclaimed open cities as it was possible to do during the last world war. But one should not allow oneself to indulge in illusions. In a future thermonuclear war, if it is touched off, there will be no difference between front and rear.

I told the Greek Ambassador: the sanest policy for Greece is to withdraw from NATO. Then in case war does break out, Greece would not suffer. The Ambassador told me: I trust that the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union would never give the order to drop atomic bombs on the Acropolis and other historic monuments of Greece.

Mr. Ambassador, I should not like to be unpleasant, but you are deeply mistaken.

Of course, as the Chairman of the Council of Ministers of the Soviet Union I shall not issue orders that bombs be dropped specifically on the Acropolis. But our hand will not falter in striking a blow at the military bases of the North Atlantic bloc which are located in Greece. In that case responsibility will rest with those who put cities, peoples and historical monuments in the line of fire.

We Are No Longer a Country of Bast Shoes

Our country, our people and the countries of the socialist camp are threatened only because we intend to sign a peace treaty. And they declare that they would fight allegedly for the freedom of Germans in West Berlin. But this is a fairy tale. West Berlin has 2,200,000 inhabitants, but if war is unleashed hundreds of millions might die. What person in his right senses would find such arguments of the imperialists convincing? Under the pretext of the defense of freedom, upon which no one is encroaching, the imperialists want to test our determination. They want to do away with our socialist gains. Your hands are too short, Messrs. imperialists!

The imperialists and colonialists are used to riding the peoples roughshod; they are accustomed to the thought that the roar of the lion makes Asian and African peoples tremble. But times have changed. The roar of the British lion no longer frightens the peoples as before. British colonialists together with the French attacked Egypt and, figuratively speaking, received a good drubbing. The Egyptians yanked the lion by the tail and threw him out.

Yes, times have changed, but the imperialists' approach has remained the same; they have kept their wolfish appetite. And it is with this wolfish appetite and the old yardstick that the colonialists are trying to approach the Soviet Union. But, gentlemen, the times when you attacked the Crimea are gone. More than a hundred years have passed since then. Even under those conditions the Russian people displayed great courage in the struggle against alien invaders. And that was a hundred years ago. Then you had to deal with tsarist Russia. But tsarist Russia is no more. It is the tsardom of the toilers that we have in our country.

The imperialists approach us as they did when Russia was known as the land of bast shoes. But we have put the bast shoe into the museum and quite long ago at that. It is only in museums that you can see the wooden plow in our country; hundreds of thousands of tractors are humming on the fields of the Soviet land. Not only do we fly in jet planes, but we have already circled the globe seventeen times in a space ship within twenty-four hours.

And the imperialists want to frighten the Soviet people! They are probably trying to frighten us because they themselves are afraid of the new socialist path along which we are irresistibly advancing towards the victory of communism, along the path outlined by Marx, Engels and Lenin. It is this that you are afraid of, Messrs. imperialists!

Advancing towards communism, we are championing the idea of peaceful competition between countries with different social systems. We do not threaten anyone. No one will die if either side wins in this peaceful competition: the people themselves will choose the best system. But those who fall back, who have not yet understood the historic development of human society, will correct themselves, catch up and take to our road, and we shall welcome them!

The United States of America is indeed living through a painful period of its development in which a great reappraisal of values is under way. Put yourself in its place, although it is as difficult for you as for me to do that. It is actors who are good at quickly impersonating kings in one moment, and proletarians in the next. So put yourself into the position of a king or some sort of prince: he is accustomed to riches, accustomed to seeing everyone come to him as a supplicant. No one is entitled to look into his eyes, but must bend low and look only at his trousers or shoes.

American imperialism, fat and strong, is accustomed, like such a king or prince, to seeing everyone bow to it and fear it. But here the Soviet Union has emerged. Our ruble was rather weak at first, but then it gained strength, matured, and now is worth more than the dollar.

Our country has turned into a great, mighty power. We have created a powerful industry, a highly developed agriculture, and have raised our science and culture. But the imperialists look at us as they did at Russia about 50 or 100 years ago.

But what is this to us? Should we come running and say: "What would you please?" This we will not do. We are telling the imperialists: you, gentlemen, did not notice us, or — to use the Ukrainians' expression — have you lost your eyes?

This shows that the imperialists have lost their sense of reality and at present they are painfully reevaluating many things.

When President Kennedy talked with me in Vienna, he stressed: "But we are a great nation." To which I replied: "This is true, but, Mr. President, the Soviet Union is a great nation too."

Incidentally, in 1960 in Paris, Mr. Macmillan kept trying to persuade me that we should meet at a conference table with Eisenhower when the latter committed an unworthy act with regard to our country. He said: "Do understand, Mr. Khrushchev, it is a great country, it is impossible for it to apologize." I replied: "What do you mean? We are a great country too, we demand an apology and without such an apology it is impossible for us to sit at the same table with those who have insulted our country!"

Therefore we are telling the imperialists: do understand that your position now is like that of an old grandfather, daddy or mummy. Their son has already exchanged shorts for long trousers, and their daughter is already dressing her hair. They already deserve to be treated as grown-ups, but the parents still want either to pull at her pigtails or box his ears.

And to some extent they approach us with that kind of yardstick. They always want to teach us: "you cannot do that," "don't do this," "if you do that, we shall box your ears." To such threats the reply can be made: "It is not your ear that we shall box; we shall hit you in a different place."

The struggle for a peace treaty with Germany is the struggle for the abolition of the remnants of World War II, for the consolidation of peace and the security of the peoples. May those who are threatening us know that his majesty the working class of the Soviet Union, of all the socialist countries, has assumed power, has created states with which the imperialists and colonialists must reckon; that the peoples of the socialist countries and their interests must be treated with respect!

I deviated from the text, prolonged my speech, and we are still to hear a speech by Comrade Dej.

Common Sense Is Needed to Avert a Disaster

Let us return to the question of military bases and of the responsibility of those who provide the territories of their countries for these bases.

In case of war, the Soviet Union, for the sake of defense — in order to protect itself — will be compelled to strike at all terri-

tories of the countries of the military NATO bloc on which military bases are located.

The Russians have a proverb: if one loses one's head, there is no use weeping over the coiffure. What's the use of monuments of antiquity if the people are dead? Here in the Soviet Union and in other socialist countries there are also historical monuments loved by the people. Therefore to protect human lives, to protect the monuments of culture, we shall have to strike a devastating blow at the aggressors. And nothing will deter us in the struggle against the aggressor, in the striving to uphold the gains of socialism and communism, to uphold peace throughout the world.

Now, more and more frequently, we hear talk from statesmen and military leaders, specifically in the United States, to the effect that they are developing a neutron bomb. The neutron bomb, as conceived by its creators, would kill everything living but leave material assets intact.

So, comrades, this is what these people are thinking. They are acting like robbers who want to murder a man without staining his suit with blood so as to be able to use the suit. This is what the neutron bomb means, in effect. It is talked about in the United States Congress and in the press. Even at a press conference the President was asked openly what his attitude was towards the development of such a bomb. But the President side-stepped the question and gave no answer.

To develop a bomb with which it would be possible to kill people but preserve all riches — here it is, the bestial ethics of the most aggressive exponents of imperialism. Is this the law of man? Man is nothing to them. To them the main thing is plunder, the quest for profit, which prods the imperialists to the most horrible crimes.

Communists prize material and spiritual riches created by man's labor and genius. But above everything else we prize man himself, who by his work created all the riches on earth. Therefore we want to defend not only the fruits of man's work but, in the first place, man himself, to defend the peoples. This is our philosophy, our ethics. This is genuine communist humanism.

We address the Greek people, the peoples of other NATO countries: realize how dangerous is the path onto which you are

being pushed by Chancellor Adenauer, by the revenge-seekers, and by all those who stand for his policy. It is a fact that if the imperialists do unleash a war, the logic and the laws of war would compel the Soviet Union and other socialist countries, even against their wishes, to strike crushing blows at aggressors wherever their military bases may be.

One must have common sense and do everything to avert a possible disaster.

Conclusion of a Peace Treaty with Germany

We consider it necessary, first of all, to remove from the relations between states the fragments of World War II and to give scope to the establishment of friendship and the development of cooperation with all states.

The conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany would benefit all the parties to it, all who really strive for peace and build their policy in the interests of peace. The Soviet Union has submitted comprehensive proposals on this question. At the same time, we are ready to hear out and consider any constructive proposals by the Western Powers.

We say to the Western Powers: do not seek in our position things that are not there. The Soviet Government does not seek to prejudice anybody's interests. It does not threaten anyone. We proceed from the real facts and we want to bring the relations among all states in line with what actually exists.

There are two German states in existence at present, and any attempt to make one Germany out of the two by way of war is doomed to failure. If such a war starts, then there will probably be nothing and nobody left in Germany to unite. This must be understood. But Chancellor Adenauer stubbornly drags his allies along the road of threats and intensification of the war danger. How can he, a man who has lived a long life, who is proud that he has not fought himself, that his sons are not officers, who calls himself a Christian and belongs to a Party which styles itself Christian, how can he call for war? It cannot be God that is suggesting such sinister thoughts to him, thoughts which are so dangerous to the German people, to all people. Adenauer says he wants to serve his people. But if he starts war, the very existence of the population of West Germany would

be put in question, and not only its existence but that of many other countries as well, because thermonuclear war is difficult to confine within the frontiers of one country.

Come to your senses, gentlemen! I appeal to those who have not lost the faculty of thinking calmly and soberly and on whom the development of the international situation depends. There was a time when the American Secretary of State Dulles brandished thermonuclear bombs and followed a policy of "from positions of strength" with regard to the socialist countries. He followed this policy with regard to all states which disagreed with the imperialist claims of the United States. That was barefaced atomic blackmail, but it had to be reckoned with at the time because we did not possess sufficient means of retaliation, and if we did, they were not as many and not of the same power as those of our opponents.

But today the situation has changed radically. And specific conclusions must be drawn from recognition of the fact that the capitalist countries are unable to force their ideology, their way of life on us, cannot compel the socialist countries to turn back. It is necessary to follow a reasonable policy on our essentially small planet which man can now circle 17 times in 24 hours.

The Soviet Union does not threaten anyone. In our atomic age it is madness to threaten to start a war. We say: let us remove the remnants of the last war, let us conclude a treaty with Germany for peace. The Soviet Government does not claim any foreign lands. We propose to record in legal form the frontiers which have been established and which have existed for many years. We only want to deprive the revanchist circles of the possibility and temptation of starting a new war for a revision, so to speak, of the results of World War II. The Soviet Government is striving for the establishment of conditions for a stable and lasting peace in Europe and throughout the whole world.

West Berlin

Of course, West Berlin is not an easy legacy of the last war. But I would not say that the question of West Berlin is in itself so difficult to solve. If the other side wished to cooperate, if it did not turn the question of West Berlin into a trial of strength, agreement would certainly be possible. And it would unquestion-

ably benefit the cause of peace. For the Soviet Union does not encroach on West Berlin, on the way of life of its population. We propose to bring the status of West Berlin into accord with peace-time conditions and the situation that actually exists in Germany and Europe.

The Soviet proposals submitted by us to the Western Powers give a reasonable way out to both sides. Nobody's prestige will suffer, nobody will become stronger at the expense of the others. It is necessary to extract the decayed tooth and enable mankind to live without pain and really sleep calmly. But the President of the United States of America painted a somber picture in his speech and, in conclusion, wished his listeners a good night. What man can sleep calmly when threats are invoked upon him and his sleep may be interrupted by explosions of atomic bombs?

War hysteria will lead to nothing good. There must be a sense of proportion and military passions should not be fanned. If feelings are let loose and they predominate over reason, then the flywheel of war preparations can start revolving at a high speed. And even when reason prompts that a brake should be put on, the flywheel of war preparations may have acquired such speed and momentum that even those who had set it revolving will be unable to stop it. The people who have set this flywheel going may become its victims. And the most terrible thing is that not only those who are setting the flywheel going may become its victims. They may push their peoples into the abyss of thermonuclear war.

All this must be taken into consideration; the laws of physics and the laws of politics must be taken into consideration.

West Berlin lies in the territory of the German Democratic Republic. The government of that state has displayed a deep understanding of the interests of the world. To help relax tensions and establish normal relations in postwar Europe, it has agreed, when it signs the peace treaty, to recognize West Berlin as a free city, to respect its sovereignty, to ensure it freedom of communication with the outside world by agreement with the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

The Soviet Union proposes that the free city status of West Berlin be ensured by reliable international guarantees. We have mentioned various possible variations of such guarantees. They

can, for instance, be provided by the four powers — Britain, France, the U. S. and the Soviet Union. There can also be other variations. It is possible to produce conditions and guarantees that would fully ensure non-interference in the affairs of West Berlin and free access to West Berlin for all states on the basis of existing international practices and international law. In a word, we are prepared to give firm guarantees not only to the population of West Berlin but also to those Western Powers which are most keen about these guarantees, although they know full well that we do not encroach upon the social system of West Berlin.

Such are our clearcut proposals. We want the German peace treaty to be finally concluded, and we will secure a peaceful settlement together with the countries which are ready to strengthen peace and friendship among nations. If the Western Powers do not want to cooperate in this important undertaking, the Soviet Union and the other peace-loving states will be obliged to sign a peace treaty with the German Democratic Republic alone.

I again say before the entire world: let us not try to intimidate each other, let us not seek out what divides us, let us not deepen the already great differences, for, after all, we do have common requirements and interests since we have to live on one and the same planet! These interests must help the peoples to get out of the present tense situation by the road of peace. We propose to sit down at the conference table and discuss calmly, without inflaming passions, in a businesslike way, what is to be done to keep the seeds of new conflicts from germinating in the soil left over from the last war.

Today I have read a report about President Kennedy's press conference. In reply to a question about the threat of a military conflict in connection with the conclusion of a German peace treaty, the President declared: "We hope that we shall be able to achieve a peaceful settlement of the problems."

Such a statement is to be welcomed. It is precisely for a peaceful settlement that the Soviet Government is striving. But in order to ensure a peaceful settlement it is necessary to conclude a peace treaty with Germany. It is only in this way that the remnants of World War II can be removed.

We should like to believe that reason will prevail in the responsible circles of the West, and first of all the United States of America, and that sabre-rattling will give way to a sober and unprejudiced view of things. We hope that the governments of the Western Powers will finally arrive at the conclusion that agreement — taking account of the existing situation in Germany, Europe, and throughout the world — would produce better results for all the peoples of the world than the dangerous playing with fire.

"Everything Will Be Done to Prevent War"

Such is our peaceful program which we offer to our people, the Communists and the Young Communist Leaguers, to all those who by their labor are strengthening and glorifying the Soviet socialist homeland.

On behalf of the Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government I should like to say once more that everything will be done to prevent war. But we shall not flinch before threats. The history of our state confirms with sufficient eloquence that we know how to safeguard our rightful cause. When fourteen imperialist powers right after the Great October Socialist Revolution attacked us, we defended the gains of October. We took the challenge of the old world and won under V. I. Lenin's leadership. We did not flinch when we were perfidiously attacked by fascist Germany. The Great Patriotic War of the Soviet people ended in our historic victory. The Soviet people are afraid of no threats. We shall not be the first to press the buttons at our rocket installations, we shall not start war, but if the imperialists force a war upon us we shall meet it bravely and deal a devastating blow at the aggressor.

The position of the Soviet Government on urgent questions of home and foreign policy was set forth in detail in the recent radio and television speech.

The Central Committee of the Communist Party and the Soviet Government were sure that the Soviet people would correctly understand the proposals of the working people that they are prepared to go over, in the defense industry in particular, to the eight-hour working day.

Permit me to express the gratitude of the Central Committee

of the Communist Party and the Council of Ministers to all workers, technicians, engineers, scientists and office employees for their correct understanding and support of the Government. As regards the proposal of the working people to switch over some of the defense enterprises to the eight-hour working day, permit us to avail of it depending on the situation. Leave it to your Government and the Central Committee of the Party.

The persistent and inspired labor of the Soviet people is yielding remarkable fruit and bringing glory to our homeland. The better we work, the higher we raise labor productivity, the better use we make of technology and science, the richer will be our life and the stronger our defense, the more unassailable will be the sacred borders of the Soviet Union.

We are strong now and our desire to ensure durable peace, to achieve general and complete disarmament is stronger than ever. We are prepared immediately to sign a treaty on disarmament and the destruction of all types of weapons under all-embracing and strict international control. It is to peace and friendship between all nations, to friendship between the peoples of the socialist countries that all thoughts and all efforts of the Soviet people are directed.

Comrades, we are building communism not alone but in the fraternal family of the socialist countries. The states of the world socialist system, united by their common aims and interests, have formed a powerful union of fighters who are courageously transforming the world and carrying into life the brightest dreams of mankind. Nobody imposed this union upon us; we have formed it ourselves, being guided by the lofty principles of proletarian internationalism, mutual assistance and support. Our commonwealth represents those historical forces to which the future belongs!

The Joint Soviet-Rumanian Communiqué signed today expresses the common viewpoint of the peoples of our countries on all the most important questions of world developments today.

We note with satisfaction that the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic supports the just proposals on the German question, and, together with all countries of socialism, is tirelessly fighting for peace. This unity of the socialist coun-

tries was once again convincingly confirmed at the Conference of the first secretaries of the Communist and Workers' Parties of the socialist countries — the participants in the Warsaw Treaty — which was held in Moscow early in August.

We wholeheartedly thank the Central Committee of the Rumanian Workers' Party and the Government of the Rumanian People's Republic for the invitation extended to the Soviet Party and government delegation to visit fraternal Rumania. We accept this invitation with great satisfaction.

Permit me, dear comrades, wholeheartedly to wish the Rumanian people further, even more outstanding achievements in building socialism.

"A fine day is recognized in the morning," says a Rumanian proverb. Now we are having a clear socialist morning of mankind. It spells a wonderful communist day. This day will come and bring a good and peaceful life to all peoples of the world. This is what the Communists of the entire socialist camp, of all countries of the world are fighting for. On this wonderful day the sun of Lenin's wisdom, the sun of communism shines brightly!

Long live the fraternal Rumanian people!

Long live the Rumanian Workers' Party!

May the unbreakable Soviet-Rumanian friendship gain in strength and flourish!

Long live the unity of the whole socialist commonwealth!

Long live world peace!

THE SOVIET GOVERNMENT'S REPLY TO THE US
GOVERNMENT NOTE OF AUGUST 17 ON STRENGTH-
ENING CONTROLS ON THE BORDER BETWEEN THE
GERMAN DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC AND WEST BERLIN,
AUGUST 18, 1961

Referring to the agreements concluded among the Four Powers in 1945 on the occupation zones in Germany and the administration of Greater Berlin, the US Government, in its note, described the measures taken by the GDR as a violation of the quadripartite status of Berlin. The Government of the US regarded the measures taken by the Government of the GDR as unlawful and protested against them.

In connection with the note of the United States Government of August 17, 1961, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics finds it necessary to declare the following:

1. The Soviet Government fully understands and supports the actions of the Government of the German Democratic Republic which has established effective control on the border with West Berlin in order to block the way to subversive activities being conducted from West Berlin against the GDR and other countries of the socialist commonwealth.

In its measures on the frontiers the Government of the German Democratic Republic merely used the ordinary right of every sovereign state to defend its interests. Any state introduces on its frontiers with other states such a regime as it regards necessary and in keeping with its lawful interests. As is known, the regime of state frontiers is one of the internal questions of any state and its settlement does not need recognition or approval by other governments. Therefore the attempts of the United States Government to interfere in the internal affairs of the German Democratic Republic are absolutely groundless and irrelevant.

2. The Government of the United States of America is, doubtless, very familiar with the causes which made the introduction of control over the traffic on the border between the GDR and West Berlin necessary and even inevitable. The United States Government itself made quite a few efforts to create these causes.

West Berlin has been turned into a center of subversive activities, sabotage and espionage, into a center of political and economic provocations against the German Democratic Republic, the Soviet Union and other socialist countries. The former and present West Berlin municipal leaders have cynically called West Berlin "an arrow in the living body of the GDR," "the frontline city," "a trouble spot," "the cheapest atom bomb planted in the center of a socialist state." The gates of West Berlin were flung wide open to international criminals and agents provocateurs of all stripes in order to intensify international tensions and extend the scope of provocations and subversive actions against the countries of the socialist commonwealth.

3. It is well-known that over 80 subversive sabotage and espionage organizations and centers have established their headquarters and are operating with impunity in West Berlin. The full names and addresses of persons engaged in hostile activities incompatible with the status of West Berlin, lying within the territory of the GDR, were given repeatedly in documents delivered to the Western Powers at those times, but the West Berlin authorities and the occupation bodies of the Three Powers did not lift a finger to put an end to these criminal activities.

The reason, apparently, is that West Berlin has become a den of adventurers, rogues, paid agents, terrorists and other criminals serving the intelligence services of the entire imperialist world, including the Central Intelligence Agency of the US, the British Secret Intelligence Service, the French Service of External Documentation and Counterespionage, and the West German subversive intelligence organizations with their numerous branches and ramifications. Things reached a point where West Berlin became the residence of the so-called "American Committee for the Liberation of the Peoples of Russia."

The question arises: do such actions have anything in com-

mon with observance of the quadripartite status established in Berlin immediately after the rout of Nazi Germany, to which the Government of the US refers in its note? One must have too great a sense of humor to claim that the activities in West Berlin accord with the quadripartite obligations.

The Soviet side repeatedly made representations to the American authorities in connection with a spy tunnel dug by American organs in the Alt-Gliennicke area of West Berlin to the communication lines of the Soviet troops and the communication lines of the GDR inside the GDR territory. That huge tunnel was equipped with special apparatuses and devices for listening in on and recording conversations on the aforesaid communication lines.

The American authorities, including the Department of State of the United States, being caught red-handed, did not even reply to these representations. Is this observance of the solemn commitments assumed by the United States of America in the quadripartite agreements concluded by the Allied Powers with regard to Germany?

But the spy tunnel in Alt-Gliennicke is a mere trifle in comparison with the tunnel which has been driven daily and hourly from the territory of West Berlin to undermine the socialist system in the GDR and other socialist states.

4. It must be well-known to the Government of the United States that, with the assistance of the occupation authorities, the Federal Republic of Germany (FRG) ruling quarters have turned West Berlin into the main base of incessant economic sabotage against the German Democratic Republic.

At the expense of taxes levied on the population of the FRG, a speculative rate of exchange of Western marks into GDR currency was arbitrarily introduced and artificially maintained in West Berlin. No city in the world has ever known such shameless speculation in currency as West Berlin, and this under the wing of the occupation authorities. The buying up of valuable goods and foodstuffs in the GDR and their export to West Berlin and the FRG were organized on an enormous scale, which inflicted tremendous damage on the population and the national economy of the German Democratic Republic.

The open frontier with West Berlin annually cost the work-

ing people of the German Democratic Republic at least 3.5 billion marks.

West Berlin lived an unhealthy feverish life, actually at the expense of the population of the German Democratic Republic and the billions of subsidies which were pumped from the pockets of the taxpayers of the FRG—its workers, office employees and farmers. The lion's share of these funds got into the hands of the black marketeers, saboteurs and subversive organizations. This was the pay for the role which the "frontline city" of West Berlin played for the benefit of the NATO military bloc in the "cold war" against the socialist countries.

From West Berlin, the FRG Government bodies and concerns directed a whole army of recruiters who used deceit, bribery and blackmail to impel a certain part of the GDR population to move to West Germany. There these people were made to serve in the Bundeswehr, to work in military production, and were drawn into various subversive organizations.

5. Implementing their aggressive militarist policy, hostile to the cause of peace, the ruling circles of the FRG converted West Berlin into an area of open revanchist gatherings and pogrom demonstrations directed against the neighboring peaceful socialist states.

The Government of the FRG made no secret of its efforts to draw the population of West Berlin into its war preparations. West German recruiting posts, providing mercenaries for the Bundeswehr, are operating on the territory of the city. It is known that there are 20,000 West Berliners serving in the West German army at present. Recruitment of soldiers from among the West Berlin population apparently plays not the least role in Bonn's plans for that part of the city.

The Government of the FRG has also tried to adapt the economy of West Berlin to its military plans. It cynically announced the extension to West Berlin of the laws making it binding on the city's industries to fulfill military orders for the Bundeswehr.

Inciting and slanderous propaganda against the Soviet Union, the GDR and other socialist countries has been conducted and is being conducted systematically by radio and television in West Berlin. Radio and television in West Berlin are subordinated to one task—to sow enmity among nations, to fan up war psychosis,

to try to organize disorders, and to transmit coded instructions to agents of Western intelligence services.

The Governments of the US, Britain and France have themselves admitted that West Berlin is not part of the FRG and cannot be administered by its organs. The Soviet Government has more than once called the US Government's attention to the impermissible actions of FRG authorities in West Berlin which are incompatible with either the present status of the city or the interests of tranquility in Europe.

Nevertheless, over 50 government institutions of the FRG are now operating in West Berlin and unceremoniously interfering in all affairs of the city, while the organs of the Bundestag and Bundesrat present their lawless claims to this part of the city.

But why is all this happening? The explanation is to be found in the connivance and direct encouragement by the Western occupation authorities who have long since bartered their commitments under the quadripartite agreements, to which they refer, for the services they get from West Germany as a member of the NATO aggressive military bloc.

Therefore they did not even once respond to any of the just demands of the Soviet Union and the GDR Government to take measures for preventing international provocations arranged by the militarist and revanchist forces of the FRG from West Berlin.

6. The German Democratic Republic has for many years been exceedingly tolerant in the face of such an absolutely revolting and impermissible situation. Carrying out its consistently peaceful and democratic policy, it made enormous sacrifices in order to facilitate the reaching of agreement between the two German states on the question of a peaceful settlement and Germany's reunification on peaceful and democratic principles.

Nevertheless, subversive activities from West Berlin against the GDR and the other socialist countries have been further extended, especially in recent times, after the submission of proposals for the immediate conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the normalization of the situation in West Berlin on this basis. The enemies of peace and tranquility in that area did not let slip a single opportunity to hamper the plans of socialist construction in the GDR, to prevent the rise in the living stand-

ards of its population, and thus by any means, stopping at nothing to complicate the situation in the republic.

It is quite understandable, therefore, that the Government of the German Democratic Republic, seeking to prevent the complication of the present international situation and responding to an appeal from the socialist states, members of the Warsaw Treaty, has taken appropriate measures to protect its national interests and the security interests of the other socialist states.

In concluding their historic agreements at the end of World War II and after the rout of nazi Germany, the USSR, the US, Britain and France jointly mapped a program for reviving the life of Germany along democratic, peaceful lines. This program has been carried out on the territory of the German Democratic Republic.

West Germany, unfortunately, as the Soviet Government has repeatedly pointed out, has followed the road of the revival of militarism, and the chauvinist and revanchist forces dangerous to the cause of peace, forces which inspired and organized nazi aggression, are again prospering there.

The Western Powers have themselves contributed to this and flagrantly violated all the foundations of the postwar Four Power agreements. In its note of August 17, the Government of the US tries to refer to the quadripartite agreements on Germany which it itself has violated. But is it possible, in destroying the whole, to retain a part of the agreement that one finds to one's advantage? And have the US Government and its organs in West Berlin guided themselves in practice by the principles of the Four Power agreements which they now invoke?

Did the separate money reform extended to West Berlin from West Germany accord with the Four Power principles? Or the establishment of "Bizonia" and a separate magistracy in West Berlin? Can these quadripartite principles, in the opinion of the US Government, be reconciled with the separate tripartite occupation status for West Berlin or the Paris agreements on the rearming of the FRG and her inclusion in NATO? Or, perhaps, the aforesaid subversive actions against the USSR, the GDR and other countries, conducted from West Berlin, also conform to the principles of Four Power cooperation?

It is sufficient to ask these questions in order to understand

the entire groundlessness and absurdity of the references by the United States Government to the aforesaid agreements.

8. The references of the Western Powers to the Allied agreements are also unwarranted because these agreements were concluded for the period of Germany's occupation and for the purposes of occupation. Much has changed in the course of the past sixteen and a half years, the face of Germany itself has changed. Two independent states have sprung up on its territory with their capitals and their borders—the socialist peace-loving German Democratic Republic and the capitalist militarist Federal Republic of Germany.

No one has the right to interfere in the affairs of these two German states as long as they fall under their internal jurisdiction. One can recognize or not recognize these real facts—they will not cease to exist because of this.

The United States Government in its note is trying to present the striving to perpetuate the occupation of West Berlin (and this sixteen years after the end of the war!) as concern for the Germans and almost as a practical expression of the right of self-determination. Such attempts cannot, of course, be taken seriously.

And if the protective measures on the border of the GDR with West Berlin create certain temporary inconveniences for the population of the city, the responsibility for this must be fully placed on the occupation authorities and the FRG Government, which did everything to prevent the improvement of the situation in that area with due consideration for the lawful interests of all states. In view of this, the protest made in the note of the United States Government is groundless and is categorically rejected by the Soviet Government.

9. As stated earlier, the measures taken by the Government of the German Democratic Republic are provisional. The Soviet Government has repeatedly emphasized that the conclusion of a peace treaty with Germany and the normalization of the situation in West Berlin on this basis will not infringe on the interests of any of the sides and will benefit the peace and security of all peoples. This is what the Soviet Government calls for from the Government of the United States.

